


# *Spearhead*

70p

No. 306 AUGUST 1994



## **Rwanda today — South Africa Tomorrow?**

***AS MORE MISERY  
OVERTAKES DARK  
CONTINENT,  
LIBERALS SHOW  
THEY NEVER LEARN***

(Commentary on page 5)



## Nationalist Comment

# WHAT WE THINK

on the month's news.

### Euro presidency dispute: Major just playing politics

This magazine, as readers will know, has not a scrap of sympathy for the political aims of those on the Continent who work for European integration. At the same time we must confess some sympathy for those people when they show irritation at the feet-dragging of their British Euro colleagues.

The British Tory Government since it took office in 1979 has persistently been out of step in the series of negotiations towards European Union yet it has remained obstinately committed to membership of a community of nations to which that union has always been the ultimate objective. The reason for this nonconformity is clear: European political and monetary integration has always been deeply unpopular with the British public and with both parliamentary backbenchers and the constituency rank and file of the Conservative Party. The Government, under both Mrs. Thatcher and Mr. Major, has therefore been constrained to perform a double act: while it has been

working inwardly towards the same aim as its partners in Europe it has constantly made gestures designed to persuade people at home that it is doing the opposite.


The latest trick in pursuit of this strategy has been the big rumpus Mr. Major has kicked up over the proposed appointment of Jean-Luc Dehaene as President of the European Commission in succession to Jacques Delors. Dehaene, like Delors, is a fanatical Euro federalist. What Major is trying to persuade us is that by opposing Dehaene as President he is in some way enhancing his credentials as an opponent of federalism himself. It is a pathetic ploy.

Who actually becomes President of the Commission makes very little difference, if any, to the speed of the drive to European integration. The real power in Europe lies with the Council of Ministers, not the Commission. Major, by imposing the British veto on Dehaene, is, as everyone in the Community knows, just playing internal British politics, not, as he would have us believe, making a stand on any great matter of principle. Hence the Franco-German annoyance at this latest little stunt by our wimp of a Prime Minister who never looks so ridiculous as when he is trying to pose as a man of strength.

But if Major has made a fool of himself over this affair so, it seems, has the Tory Right at Westminster, whose leading spokesmen were reported to be cooing with pleasure at his performance. The headline in *The Sunday Telegraph* on June 26th said: 'Tory delight as Major uses EC veto.' In the report underneath it continued:-

"Many Tory MPs, including some who have been openly critical of Mr. Major's leadership over recent months, applauded his stand.

"One of the Prime Minister's most prominent critics on the backbenches, John



### THE 'STRONG MAN' SMILES

This picture of John Major was taken at the recent Euro conference in Corfu, just after he had slapped the veto on the appointment of Jean-Luc Dehaene as President of the Commission. The Premier seems very pleased with himself over an action which means very little in terms of Britain's future in Europe.

Carlisle, said Mr. Major was 'at last' showing real strength of leadership. 'Good for him. At last he has been wielding his predecessor's handbag. It is just exactly what people wanted to see.'

"Sir George Gardner, chairman of the 92 Group of Tory right-wingers, said: 'John Major has shown we mean business in the Community.'"

Do these 'right-wingers' really believe their own words? Is Mr. Carlisle really convinced that the Prime Minister is showing "real strength of leadership"? Or is all this just part of the act that has to be put on to maintain the charade of internal Tory Party politics? We don't know, but perhaps John Carlisle, when he spoke of Major "wielding his predecessor's handbag," was getting nearer the truth than he realised. Handbag diplomacy — that's just about it! It succinctly sums up what Britain has sunk to in the final decade of the 20th century.

### 'Racial attacks' hysteria mounts

During the last few months the campaign

## Spearhead

No.306 AUGUST 1994  
PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW  
Editor: John Tyndall

*Spearhead* exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British Nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its Editor and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless it is specifically stated otherwise, the views expressed in signed articles or letters in *Spearhead* are the sole responsibility of their writers and do not necessarily represent the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisation that *Spearhead* may support editorially.

The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* does not necessarily indicate that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function being advertised.

*Spearhead* welcomes enquiries from prospective advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of the month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse to publish advertisements submitted.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts for articles for possible publication, which normally should not be longer than 1,250 words unless specifically pre-arranged with the Editor, and should be typed in double-spacing. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless the writers specifically request otherwise at the time they submit their manuscripts. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles accepted for publication should he deem this necessary.

Those wishing to reprint *Spearhead* articles should ensure when doing so to give public acknowledgement to both the writer and *Spearhead*, and to include in the acknowledgement the full name and address of the magazine.



to pressure the Government into bringing in new legislation against so-called 'racists' has moved up a gear or two. According to *The Times* (23rd June):-

"An all-party committee of MPs has been urging the overhaul of public order laws to make it easier for the police and courts to take action against people suspected of stirring up racial hatred and harassment. Police forces where there are large ethnic minority communities should set up racial incident units to deal exclusively with attacks and harassment and also to encourage people from the black and Asian communities to contact officers."

*The Times* went on to quote a section of the committee's report to the Government, which said:-

"We are alarmed by evidence presented to us of the growth in the number of racial attacks, not only on immigrant communities but also on traditional established Jewish communities in parts of Britain where there have been previously no racial incidents."

Further on, the committee's report, according to *The Times*, said that:-

"... racial incident units at police stations encouraged members of ethnic minority communities to report racial attacks and helped the police to build contacts with their communities."

Has the reader noticed something strange and interesting about these statements? In every reference to 'racial attacks' and 'racial harassment' it is assumed that only ethnic minority group members are the victims, never native British Whites. There is talk of encouraging "people from the black and Asian communities to contact officers," but no reference to Whites doing so. There is reference to attacks "not only on immigrant communities but also on traditional established Jewish communities..." but there is nothing about attacks on white communities. The report mentions racial incident units at police stations encouraging "members of ethnic minority communities" to report racial attacks, but it says nothing about members of white communities being thus encouraged.

From all this it might be supposed that white people are never subjected to racial attacks or racial harassment. Anyone who lives in an area that has been made an experimental ground for multi-racialism knows that this simply isn't true. Whites are at least as often the victims of these kinds of attacks and harassment as any of the members of ethnic minorities are, but it seems that this all-party committee of MPs simply isn't interested in cases where white people suffer.

Attacks on anyone committed for motives of race are to be deplored, but no more so if the victims are non-white than if they are white — and no more so than if the attack is committed for other motives, such as revenge, family quarrels, sex, politics or just ordinary crime.

But this, apparently, is not the way this

all-party committee of MPs sees it. One of the objectives of the committee is to get the Government to support legislation which will empower courts dealing with cases of assault to add an additional penalty of up to five years' imprisonment if the assault is committed for a racial motive. How about that?

As one of our correspondents said in a letter published last month, the logic of this is that if you bash an old lady over the head with the object of taking her handbag that will be a lesser offence than hitting a muscular young Black in a racial argument. Could there be any better instance of demonstrating that the law is an ass? Yet there are influential people at work in British politics who seek to twist the law to this very purpose.

The latest news is that the Home Secretary, Mr. Michael Howard, has rejected this particular proposal — though for how long it will remain rejected, what with the immense pressures being exerted to get it on the statute book, we cannot say. Most probably, Mr. Howard is concerned less with the injustice inherent in the whole idea than with the opposition it might generate among the British people, who are sick to death with this pretence that 'racial attacks' are only a white-on-black or white-on-Asian phenomenon.

One further word might be said about this 'racial attacks' hype. Quite clearly it is a flagrantly dishonest attempt to shift the debate about race from the central and most important issues, which concern the theory of 'race equality' and the question of whether the multi-racial experiment is good for Britain and the other white nations upon which it has been foisted, to an entirely subsidiary and peripheral issue, which concerns attacks on people committed for racial motives.

The debate thereby becomes one of whether one supports 'racial attacks' rather than whether one supports multi-racialism and the theory of race equality. It should not of course be difficult to achieve a general national consensus in support of racial attacks being a bad thing. Very few people would dissent from that view, and we certainly do not dissent from it. It is not, however, the issue that lies at the heart of the race question.

This is a point which our editor hoped to be able to make as contributor to a discussion on 'racial attacks' that was due to take place on *The Frost Programme* on June 16th. In the original plan for this discussion he had been invited to appear on the programme along with Sir Ivan Lawrence, Chairman of the all-party committee that has set itself up to advise the Government on new 'anti-racist' legislation. Mr. Tyndall had intended to face Sir Ivan with a challenge on this matter, and also to ask him why the terms of reference of his committee's report did not include racially motivated attacks on Whites. Sir Ivan, along with three others, however, refused to appear on the pro-

gramme with Mr. Tyndall, and in the end the whole project was scrapped — another victory for 'democracy' of course!

## Our Heir Apparent

Ever since Prince Charles consented to have himself put under the microscope in the Jonathan Dimbleby interview on June 29th, the correspondence columns of newspapers have been deluged with letters for and against him. At a glance, it would seem that the vast majority of these letters were supportive. Whether that reflects actual public opinion or merely the preferences in selecting letters exercised by editors we have no way of knowing.

What we can say is that if the great numbers of letters professing support for HRH are in fact representative of the way the British public feels that does not say too much for the perspicacity of said British public.

The Prince of Wales came over to us as a weak, not overly intelligent and nauseatingly self-pitying individual chronically unfitted for the duties of state for which birth has selected him. While repeatedly he seemed to be posing as a conservative and traditionally minded individual, scornful of 'political correctness', equally repeatedly he betrayed himself as all too much influenced by modern 'trendy' attitudes. He must, for instance, have given great joy to the PC brigade when he stated his preference for being 'Defender of Faith' rather than Defender of the faith — a grovelling concession to the ethnic minority religions whose spokesmen are noisily demanding equality with the Church of England and other traditional denominations indigenous to this country.

Equally, Charles put himself solidly on the side of modern 'progressive' thinking, when he spoke of Britain's armed forces, of which he is destined one day to be Commander in Chief, playing an increasing role as 'international policeman' and in fact being paid for their services by the countries they helped — becoming in effect mercenaries.

All these things aside, however, there seems no doubt that the matter of greatest interest to the British public is Prince Charles' private love life, on which he was put on the spot by questions from Mr. Dimbleby more challenging than any he had yet faced publicly. One question occurred as part of the original text, which was published in advance in some of the newspapers but on the day omitted from the broadcast TV version. Asked about adultery, Charles replied, as if in self-acquittal, that "it happens to half the people in this country."

Now that really is thoroughly modern and 'progressive'! In days gone by, when people committed adultery we did not think of it "happening to them." They made it happen themselves. Now, apparently, all this has changed. Adultery 'happens' to people in

Contd. overleaf



much the same way as rain falling upon them or injuries sustained by them as a result of accidents. No blame or responsibility whatever is to be attached to them — it is all an unfortunate stroke of fate!

Charles showed in the interview a great deal of resentment at the fact that the news media would not allow him to enjoy a normal private life, likening himself in the eyes of the media to a 'performing monkey'. Well, it is far from being this magazine's habit to defend the news media, but in this case we can only say that both Prince Charles and certain other members of the royal family have only themselves to blame for the media interest in their private lives that has been generated. In an age when every public person ought to know something of the fundamentally subversive and nationally destructive nature of the media and the immense potential for damage that resides in them, every such person should take all the more care to conduct his or her own life in such an impeccable way as to provide the media with little or no fuel for gossip. If Charles and his ilk acted more responsibly in the conduct of their personal affairs, the media would not leave them alone but they would assuredly pester them much less than is the case today. In short, Prince Charles really has no cause to whine about media sensationalism surrounding his affairs; he has brought that sensationalism upon himself by his own reckless disregard for the duties of his position.

All these things are said, not from an anti-monarchist position, but from a position of the strongest support for the monarchy as an institution. The question this country must now seriously begin to ask itself is whether, as at certain junctures of our past history, the time has arrived, not for the abolition of monarchy, but for a change of royal dynasty. This is a change which Britain will most certainly have to consider at such time as the present Queen's reign comes to an end, for it is much to be feared that the man marked down as her successor may be such a disaster as King as to damage Britain's monarchy beyond repair. And if that were to happen every vile and treacherous creature within the woodwork of this nation would have great cause to rejoice.

## The Britannia question

The question of the future of the royal yacht *Britannia* is inevitably linked to the present troubles of the monarchy, but in fact it should be considered as a separate issue. Whether we retain or scrap this national symbol depends not upon our appraisal of this or that individual in the royal family but upon the kind of nation we wish to present ourselves to the world as being in the years to come. *Britannia* must be understood primarily to be the property, not of the royal family, but of Britain.

The maintenance of *Britannia* is not something that can be done on the cheap. But in fact the yacht costs a great deal less money than many other things paid for from out of the public purse which have far less national value but which many belonging to the 'Scrap *Britannia*' brigade regard as sacred cows. One is our vast overseas aid programme. Another is the race relations industry. Yet another is Britain's financial contribution to the European Community. No, let us be honest about it: the argument put up against the retention of *Britannia* is inspired not so much by concern for economy as plain dislike of all public symbols which reflect prestige and importance on Britain. The opponents of *Britannia* are the sort of people who positively revel in this country's diminished role in the world and are ever seeking ways to diminish it yet further. They are the real 'Little Englanders' — as distinct from those who have, quite wrongly, been given that name for opposing European integration. The very fact that these people are so eager to see the royal yacht delivered to the breaker's yard, or at the very best reduced to some kind of commercial cruise ship or floating museum, is one good reason why it should be retained in its traditional role.

Of course no-one will dispute that Britain's diminished world position is a modern fact, and that there is an element of *folie de grandeur* in the maintenance of symbols and institutions which seem to assume we are as big and important a power as we were in the past. At the same time it seems to us that it is wholly destructive and negative to destroy those symbols and institutions for no other reason but to cut off our nose to spite our face. The correct remedy to Britain's present puniness is to work to restore her former strength. Other nations prominent in the world of today have recovered from annihilating defeat in major wars to surpass our own in wealth, power and achievement. To maintain that we cannot ourselves recover from setbacks much less devastating is to deliver a contemptuous verdict on the capability of the British people. It amounts, basically, to defeatism. And those who argue for the ditching of *Britannia*, along with other symbols of its kind, are to be counted as the professional defeatists.


## The weed factor

Britain's armed forces, according to a recent report, are having to turn away 40 per cent of teenagers applying to join because of the latter's appalling physical condition.

The *Sunday Times* on July 10th spelled it out:-

"Senior officers say the decline in traditional competitive games in Britain's schools and the layabout lifestyles of young people have increased the number who are unsuited to the physical demands of military life.

"The problem is so bad that the army has



## TOUGH GOING

This young army recruit at Pirbright seems to be making heavy weather of his pull-ups. According to the forces, 40 per cent of rookies are now physically below par, due to modern British lifestyles.

introduced a new physical test to weed out those too weedy, and has started special 'remedial' platoons where unfit or injured recruits are given individualised training programmes."

The report went on to say that:-

"Unhealthy eating habits and a more sedentary lifestyle has (*sic*) provided a generation of teenagers lacking physical strength. They are either flabby or overweight or lacking in muscle toning and scrawny."

This report, of course, only tells us what we should already know. A mere look at any crowded street or town centre in this country would confirm what the armed forces have found: that Britain's young people of today are, in very large numbers, appallingly under par physically.

But why should we suddenly have to wake up to a truth that has been evident for many years? In fact it is a national disgrace that things were ever allowed to reach the pass that they have, and it just demonstrates the



total lack of concern for physical health and fitness that has been characteristic of one government after another for as long as anyone can remember.

And neither is the phenomenon a new one. Those who were old enough to have served actively in World War II will be able to testify to the low physical standards evident in a great many recruits, which contrasted markedly with the superb health and fitness to be found among our German adversaries — a health and fitness which gave them a flying start in the way of military capability.

This, of course, is a depressing commentary on the type of citizen produced by a *laissez-faire* society, with its obsession for individual 'freedom' and its horror of national discipline and organisation. The *Sunday Times* report quotes armed forces officers as talking about a "layabout lifestyle." Of course, that is precisely what it is. Britain's young people are just left to lounge about street corners frittering away their time to no useful purpose whatsoever, prone to the enticement of drugs because no-one has ever bothered to imbue them with a sense of the importance of fitness and health and because all political leaders and governments are terrified of embracing the idea that youth needs discipline, organisation and leadership lest — horror of horrors! — this sounds like 'fascism'.

So what ought to be done? First of all, government should lay down, and ensure to enforce, a decree that all schools devote several hours a week to hard physical training and tough sports. At the same time it should launch a national youth movement which will continue the process after time at school has finished and youngsters are either in higher education or out at work. Last but not least, national military service should be restored for all young men, during which fitness regimes should be introduced universally which aspire to standards close to those of today's Royal Marines and Paratroopers.

Along with this, there should be a national drive to improve Britain's diet, which today consists much too much of junk foods and which lacks the basic nutrition needed to build a healthy race. Food companies which fail to maintain the required standards should be heavily penalised and, after repeated transgressions, have their licences to trade withdrawn.

In these times it would be well to recall the words of that presently out-of-fashion poet Rudyard Kipling, who once wrote:-

"Nations have passed away and left no traces,  
And history gives the naked cause of it —  
One single, simple reason in all cases;  
They fell because their peoples were not fit."

## The eternal African

Now it's Rwanda. Before that it was Somalia, and a little while previously Ethiopia, the Sudan, Mozambique and a score of other countries whose names seem

too numerous to remember. The tragedies repeat themselves with monotonous regularity: governmental corruption and brutality, inter-tribal war, anarchy, incompetence, poverty, starvation, disease, the mass exodus to pastures thought to be new and better but which turn out only to be the same.

And as a knee-jerk reaction, the agonised breast-beatings of the western liberal conscience. "We must do something" — or "we're not doing enough." Aid programmes, massive grants (the British Government has just authorised the sending of £6 million to Rwanda), western relief workers descending like locusts on the area of current crisis, heart-rending TV news reports showing living skeletons, with commentaries whose tones of piety are so uniform they might have been the product of hours of rehearsal and training — the lowering of the voice at the exact right moment, the pregnant pause, the implicit hectoring of those at home for their seeming lack of 'concern'. It is all there, and we have heard it so often before.

But behind this familiar symphony there are signs that serious thinking is beginning to filter through in challenge to the lump-in-the-throat dogma on Africa that has dominated western doctrine for the past three decades: the dogma that deems decolonisation to have been axiomatically right, and which shrugs off every post-colonial catastrophe as a mere 'teething trouble' for which westerners must bear responsibility and which it is their solemn duty to relieve.

Anthony Daniels, writing in the *Sunday Telegraph* on July 24th, critically examined every conventional theory about Africa's woes and dismissed each in turn. It is not, he said, the existence of artificial nation-states within European-determined boundaries because where boundaries have reflected the will of Africans the outcome has been no better — Rwanda itself being just one example. It is not exploitation by multi-national companies because without that exploitation the African condition would be much worse. It is not the absence in so many African countries of free market economies because where those economies have had some trial they have failed to deliver much improvement in standards — Kenya and the Ivory Coast being cited as cases in point.

Daniels, continuing to the end of his article in similar vein, was short on specific solutions and at no point dared to suggest the obvious: that the problems of Africa might have something to do with the nature of the African himself — a 'racist' idea which is strictly out of bounds to 'free press' journalists. Dr. Myles Harris, writing in the *Daily Mail* the day before, did at least hint at something practical. "The problem," he said, "is that to send aid, while making no attempt at active interference, only prolongs the misery, keeping a patient alive on a ventilator so that he can suffer further tragedy." The answer, he continued, "is

that the West must once again rule in parts of Africa." And in his concluding words he reiterated the theme, stating that: "It is not really a question of should we go back, but when."

So far as he goes, Dr. Harris is right, but whether he and newspaper writers like him would be prepared to pursue his proposals to their logical ends is a matter of doubt. Would he and they accept that in the light of what has happened in Rwanda and elsewhere the whole policy of delivering South Africa from white to black rule is a mistaken one and should be reversed?

That question at the moment remains unanswered, and for the moment we can depend on the policies of the western powers towards Africa remaining unchanged. This will mean that what once was the prosperous, orderly and well-governed republic of South Africa will continue uninterrupted along the path to the chaos and misery that is Rwanda, while *bien pensants* sitting in Islington drawing rooms and in the members' enclosure at Lords reflect with contentment that this constitutes progress towards a happier, saner and fairer world.

## 'Forbidden' art

An exhibition of German Romantic art opening in Edinburgh on the 28th July includes a group of paintings produced in the Hitler period and rarely seen during the past half-century. According to The Arts section of the *Sunday Express* of July 24th, "The cover-up has been so great that many are unaware such art exists."

The *SE* report, by Alice Beckett, went on to say that: "Political fears and embarrassment over such works meant only a few scholars were allowed to view them... But in Jewish circles anxiety is rising that these paintings are being publicly acknowledged as art in Britain."

Now isn't that extraordinary? Have we not been taught to believe that totalitarianism in art was a Nazi concept? Only dictators, so it is said, presume to tell the people what art they should see and not see. Yet now it is admitted that certain paintings have been hidden away from public view for all these years merely because they first saw the light of day in National Socialist Germany and because Hitler approved of them!

It is not as if the paintings were themselves in any way political. According to the *SE* report, they simply show harmless scenes of German families sitting at home and peasants scattering seeds on the land. Apparently, what is objectionable about them is the 'Aryan' appearance of the human figures featured and the fact that, unlike figures in modern art, they bear some resemblance to their subjects!

This, apparently, makes such art 'dangerous' — so dangerous that 'Jewish circles' are anxious about it being acknowledged as art at all.

What a commentary on the times in which we live!



# IN THE BEGINNING MUST BE WORK

JOHN TYNDALL looks at needed reforms in the Welfare State and puts forward the necessary preconditions

HOW FAR should the state go in protecting the individual, and how far should that individual be required to survive through thrift, enterprise, hard work and self-reliance? This debate has raged at the centre of British politics for as long as anyone living can remember. It has always been a major issue dividing the left from the right of the conventional political spectrum, and today it is returning to centre stage with added heat as society in this country manifests all the symptoms of pending collapse. A vast and growing 'underclass' infests our towns and cities, and the British public is waking up to the fact that for many years it has been subsidising this underclass not only in the way of provision of the basic necessities of life but, further, with the means to buy brand new video recorders and music centres, run expensive cars and enjoy holidays on the Mediterranean. We are learning that young single women are going out of their way to bear children for no better reason than that the extra welfare payments for which they will then qualify will substantially improve their standard of living. Clearly, the social system has got completely out of hand.

But equally, there is little chance of a reversion to Thatcherism, the social ethic that abandoned all social ethics almost entirely. Much of what we see today in the way of the underclass is the direct result of the application of Thatcher principles — an atomised society dominated by a spirit of individual selfishness and greed, a society in which private economic power was granted rights and privileges practically without limit.

Somewhere there is a healthy balance between those obligations that rest with the individual and those that belong to the state. We have failed so far to find it in Britain, and we must find it if there is to be national recovery. It is apposite at this point to look back to discover first principles, and we might do so by application of the old Greek formula of Thesis, Antithesis and Synthesis.

## DARWINISM

First, Thesis. In the most primitive forms of human organisms a kind of social Darwinism held sway. In the most brutal struggle for existence the strong and capable survived and the weak and less capable either perished or were reduced to the most miserable level of penury. Everything that

went by the name of 'property' had simply been acquired by the stronger elements by use of naked force. Where there was anything approaching 'government' it was established on the same principles. 'Law' was simply the enforcement of the will of the possessing classes, which equally was the sole criterion of 'rights'.

Life under such conditions must undoubtedly have been harsh, and few today would wish to return to them. Nevertheless, the system, such as it could be called a system at all, did have one priceless value: it was thoroughly evolutionary in as much as it brought about a genetic strengthening with every generation. Inferior individuals and stocks perished and superior ones survived, prospered and multiplied themselves.

Now to Antithesis. There was bound to be some point at which human nature would rebel against this primitive order. In fact the point long pre-dated Christianity, which has no monopoly of humanitarian impulses nor of social mores. Societies usually comprising kingdoms came to be formed, based sometimes on tribal foundations and sometimes merely on baronial domination of a given geographical area — leading later to the formation of nations as we now know them. In each case the impulse towards these social groupings came in large part from the need for the whole to function as a cohesive unit for the purpose of common defence against rivals; but whatever the nature of the drive towards a more social form of organisation, the fact was that the previous anarchy had become popularly unacceptable. Actual ethics generally had little to do with the matter; dominant individuals, families or other groups learned that the velvet glove had to be applied as well as the iron fist — in other words, their positions would have to rest at least in part on the freely given allegiance of their subjects. A principle of fairness became established, giving birth to concepts of justice, and ultimately to law. This process did not take place because it was 'right'; it occurred simply out of the play of natural forces. People won certain 'rights' not because those rights were 'inalienable', as the American Declaration of Independence would put it, but because those people were able to win them — by a process that may have been political, may have rested on force or may have comprised a combination of the two.

From these early beginnings we were set on the path to the social state as we know it

today. That path was unavoidable once total individual free will was discarded and the simplest forms of collective human organisation were adopted. In time the process acquired a name. The name was 'Civilisation'.

## GENETIC DANGER

From the very start, this metamorphosis towards civilisation had a danger, and the danger was a genetic one. No longer would purely evolutionary principles govern the breeding of human species. The weaker and less capable strains would be protected by laws and accorded rights. Later the development of medical science would further accentuate the tendency, producing artificial means for sustaining life that in the normal course of evolution would die out in nature's bitter struggle.

All of this is said without reference to the question of whether the process was good or bad, right or wrong — that is to say without any regard for the moral aspects of the question. This is not because such moral aspects do not matter, only because they are in this context irrelevant. The process happened and was certain to happen, and that is all we should be concerned about here. Indeed it could be said that the movement away from pure primitive evolution was itself in a sense evolutionary, in as much as it took place as part of the natural order and represented what men (at least among the higher races) willed.

We cannot know for certain how clearly those who laid the path to civilisation were aware of the genetic dangers inherent in the process, but what we can say is that if they were aware of those dangers the latter were a price they were prepared to pay for what was seen generally as a great improvement in the human condition.

Such dangers could anyway be debated. It could be argued that with man in his most primitive state the qualities required for survival were mainly physical, supplemented perhaps by determination and ruthlessness but not excluding intelligence of a most self-centred kind. Evolution would therefore have been in favour of that type. Excluded from its process would have been the type of intellect and spirit later giving birth to creativity in the arts and sciences. Excluded also would have been that priceless though not often considered gene of altruism which has been such an important element in the

*Contd. on next page*



breeding of great rulers.

So we may see that the movement towards civilisation did undoubtedly effect some genetic change in as much as it called for more diverse survival qualities. At the same time it was not necessarily dysgenic. The dysgenic process began to occur when the civilising tendency ran out of control. This happened when man became infected with a belief in unlimited 'progress', with the conceit that he could prevail over nature and reverse her laws. The name we have given to this development is **liberalism**.

Liberalism's bequest to mankind is what Sir Arnold Lunn has referred to as "the cult of softness." With liberalism, every political and social impulse is inspired by an idealisation of the sickly and the weak, and by the desire to make life as easy for the more lowly elements of society as possible. Liberalism of course always begins with a profession of sentiment with which few can quarrel. It appeals to people's natural sense of charity and kindness. But the liberal, having embarked upon a particular course of thinking and doing, seems congenitally incapable of knowing where to stop. Liberalism (small 'l', not to be confused with the Liberal Party) was a major force making for the Welfare State in Britain — although admirable welfare states had been established in some other countries under governments far from 'liberal'. In many of its initial innovations the Welfare State achieved much that was good. Here one thinks of the free health service, state pensions, industrial accident insurance, unemployment benefit — plus free state education, though this of course pre-dates the Welfare State as such. The Welfare State in its earlier stages in Britain was introduced to a population that was patriotic, homogeneous, law-abiding and in the main sturdy and self-reliant by instinct. If decadence was far advanced in the country, it had not yet much touched the classes that were to be the Welfare State's main beneficiaries, so that there was some promise that that Welfare State's potential abuses were for the moment limited and far off. That such abuses would not be allowed to grow to the point at which the Welfare State would become an instrument for the degeneration of the British people was something which depended, of course, on that system remaining in the hands of strong and prudent government.

Some of the more far-sighted in this country recognised that this would not happen. Liberal Democracy being the environment into which the Welfare State in Britain was born, the seeds of its corruption were present at the very beginning. It is in the very nature of governments and political parties in a democracy that they must constantly be bribing their electors with largesse of various kinds. Every party's political success depends on its ability to promise a life increasingly cosy for those who vote it into power. Democratic politicians are forced by the necessity of the system in which they operate to appeal to



#### A MASCULINE ENVIRONMENT

These youngsters, seen here during military training, learn to value manhood and to live a tough world. The majority of male British youth today, however, grow up and are educated in an atmosphere which encourages softness and effeminacy.

every selfish and greedy instinct among the people. Great numbers of votes are to be bought by conceding 'rights', far fewer by insisting on duties. Add to this basic truth the presence in Britain of an increasing number of noisy and demanding minorities, all of which possess voting power, and you have the recipe for the politics of irresponsibility — the ever-growing tendency to satisfy the acquisitiveness of the present at the expense of the future.

The result is that what began as a policy which was both noble as an ideal and practical in its national utility has become a gigantic milch cow upon which every parasitic element in the nation gorges itself for all it can get. The Welfare State as it is today in Britain screams out for reform. Hence we arrive at the need for **Synthesis**.

#### THE WELFARE SYNTHESIS

It is well at this point to remind ourselves of the background to the equation. 'Thesis' began with an assertion of the evolutionary needs of a society in which there is an ever-present element of toughness and competition, a social order geared to stimulate human effort and to serve the eugenic purpose of encouraging the breeding of the better elements in the population. To this may be added the truth that all the best human achievement occurs under the stress of pressure: the need to strive and fight for a better life. This is the case with nations

just as with individuals.

'Antithesis' consists of the corrections and adjustments to this rule that are needed as the individuals in any society become more closely interdependent and as that society is obliged to achieve unity and cohesion in the face of its external competitors, including its natural enemies. In such a society any large portion that is discontented and alienated becomes a liability, in other words a source of weakness rather than of strength. Besides this, the practicalities of internal politics demand that any state should avoid the trap of presenting sympathy and support to those who would destroy it. Failure to understand this has been one of the major weaknesses of conservative forces in the 20th century. British Conservatism, in particular, seems not to have grasped it even today.

So 'Synthesis' becomes a question of reconciling these two needs present in 'Thesis' and 'Antithesis': a tough and competitive society that breeds abler and stronger people, but at the same time one that is not torn apart by internal division but is able to function as a cohesive whole in a world in which tough competition between nations and races largely supersedes that between individuals.

There will be many who will maintain that the latter requirement leads us to acceptance, whether we like the word or not, to some form of socialism.

*Contd. overleaf*



## IN THE BEGINNING MUST BE WORK

(Contd. from prev. page)

A valuable contribution to the current debate on this subject came from Andrew Alexander in his column in the *Daily Mail* on July 1st. Heading this piece 'Spoiled by a nanny state', he began by attacking the findings of a recent government survey on road safety, which said that bicyclists wearing helmets suffer far fewer serious injuries than those who do not. Implicit in this finding was that the Government was now considering introducing a law making helmets compulsory to all using bicycles. This, said Alexander, was "a symptom of national decay." The reason? It indicated an unhealthy obsession with human safety, and he went on to explain:-

"At various stages of their development, societies are marked by the dominance of either masculine or feminine qualities. The masculine ones include boldness, courage, vigour, loyalty, determination, ambition and originality. The feminine characteristics are the gentler ones associated with nurturing: compassion, kindness, devotion, the pursuit of security in general and, thus, of physical safety.

"When a society is in the ascendant — Britain in the 19th century is a good example — the masculine qualities are to the fore. And those who display them become the popular heroes: soldiers, explorers, colonisers, inventors, self-made men.

"Such a society is itself characterised by vigour, ambition, innovation, the originality of its artists — and, of course, its competitiveness with other nations.

"A society moves into decline when the feminine characteristics become dominant. Note, please, that I say **dominant**. I do not suggest that these qualities are not vital. A society without them would be barbaric, intolerable and doomed to decay.


"But when a society puts the greater emphasis on the feminine qualities, it gives up the drive for innovation and expansion in favour of preservation, equality and welfare — and, of course, safety. Security becomes the great goal.

"The test of public figures becomes not whether they are bold or adventurous, but whether they display 'compassion'. Admiration is reserved for those who care rather than for those who dare."

As if to underline this further on, Alexander continued:-

"The point is the switch of **emphasis**. When society's main question about its leaders — the electorate's demand if you like — is not whether they are bold and original, vigorous and determined, but whether they have the gentler qualities, then we know that a period of decline has set in. Comfort, not achievement, has become the goal."

Alexander's point can be illustrated perfectly in the faces and bearing of our contemporary government ministers by comparison with the leaders of nations (including our own in the past) in the full



## NO WORK

This is Swan Hunter shipyard on Tyneside just after closure last year. When local communities grow with the development of great industries and then those industries are allowed to die, it is futile telling the redundant workers they must be more 'self-reliant'.

flower of their vigour. The latter will portray strength and virility, while the former almost uniformly give impressions of softness. Britain's present Premier most of all epitomises the second type, while contrasts are in abundance in the persons of Bonaparte, Bismarck and our own Chatham and Palmerston. Says Alexander:-

"If you accept my general analysis, many features of the nation's life fall into perspective — even foreign policy. For half a century, the preoccupation of the Foreign Office has been with getting Britain **liked**, not with the pursuit of national interests."

But from what recruiting grounds have Britain's post-war Foreign Office officials been drawn? Predominantly from Oxford and Cambridge. Look at any college photograph from those centres of learning over the past half-century and you will see a depressing prevalence of weak, passive faces. Then look at photos from the same walls taken in Victorian times and you will notice a difference which reflects the contrasting spirit of this country in the heyday of Empire. It is not the race that has changed — for I am here speaking of those from the indigenous white Anglo-Celtic population — but the values and priorities of the two societies, past and present. These Victorians were drawn mainly from public schools which from the earliest years encouraged the development of manly qualities; today's university graduates are the products of educational institutions, and of a contemporary culture, slanted ever more towards political correctness, in whose book the male-female polarity is an unwanted remnant of 'sexism'.

Andrew Alexander has illustrated, as an example of this late-twentieth century

decadence, the obsession with 'safety'. I would venture to suggest two more examples which perhaps make the point even better.

## TOLERATION OF HOMOSEXUALITY

One is the modern attitude to homosexuality, which is contrasted with the Victorian one as enlightenment is contrasted with the dark ages. What is noticeable is that conventional views on this subject are presented as wiser because they are said to be founded on 'reason', and I am ready to accept that on the basis of reason alone the modern view may win the debate against the Victorian view — it is, after all, easy enough to argue that reason and logic do not support the outlawing of a practice that harms no-one beyond the practitioners themselves, and, further, that stigmatising homosexuality socially is not going to alter those whose natural disposition is towards it.

But there was in fact a wisdom in the Victorian attitude on this matter which defies pure logic and reason but is none the less sound for that fact. This Victorian attitude was simply the voice of **instinct** — the instinct of a society dedicated to the values of true manhood and true womanhood. This society did not feel the need to 'explain' or 'justify' its repudiation of sexual perversion. Least of all did it bother itself with the thought that its laws and conventions were 'uncaring' towards queers. As Andrew Alexander has said, the Victorian century was one in which masculine qualities were to the fore; and the masculine mind accepts that a price we have to pay for the maintenance of a strong and sturdy society is that some of its members will feel themselves harshly treated.

Contd. on next page



Another example which Mr. Alexander might have cited had he had the space is the way in which school bullying has been made into a public, even a political, issue. When I was a schoolboy in the 1940s and early 1950s bullying was understood as part of the natural order. That is not to say that it was approved of, only that it was something seen as having its own local self-corrective mechanism, without questions having to be asked in parliament about it, as is happening today. The bigger boy who picks on the smaller boy and makes life unpleasant for him is part of the normal school scene. When it happens, the smaller boy has two options open to him. He can go running to teacher, in which case he is despised; or he can hit back, in which case he is respected. In the masculine school culture there is no dishonour in putting up a fight and losing; there is dishonour only in cowardice. Admittedly, for a little 'un in the school playground it is something of an intimidating prospect to have to stand up to an aggressor a good deal heavier than himself. But it is at the same time a test of his character, and if he comes through that test, albeit as the eventual loser, he is admired by his fellows and probably not picked on again. At the same time, if a fight of such uneven proportions shows danger of getting completely out of hand, it is usual for others to intervene to prevent serious injury. Bullying is part of the rough and tumble of life among boys at school, and so it has been for centuries.

It is when people start thinking that this practice calls for preventive action at political level that we have reached a pass when we really ought to start analysing ourselves as a nation, and asking ourselves have we lost all our sense of manhood? The tendency, like that involving the debate about compulsory helmets for bike-riders, is a sign of decadence.

## WHAT MUST NOW BE DONE

The foregoing may seem like digressions from the original theme of the Welfare State, but they have been incorporated into the discussion because they bear vitally on what kind of a nation we wish ourselves to be, and it is that view of ourselves as a nation which must shape our attitude to welfare in all its departments. To put it simply, do we wish to be a strong nation or a soft one? Most people would opt for the former, but in that case they must accept the consequences in the way of the future structure of our social system and its rewards and penalties.

Leaving aside the lunatic left, it is not difficult to reach a broad consensus among British people on the principles that should underlie any approach to reform of the Welfare State. Those principles would amount simply to: help for those in genuine need but not for those not in need. In other words, action should be taken by the state to get off its back the vast army of shirkers, ponces, parasites and inadequates who presently batten upon it — so that its

resources can then be directed to providing assistance to those whose misfortune is not their own fault and for which there is no other remedy. This policy calls, from the beginning, for an attitude similar to that desired by Mr. Alexander in his article: one in which masculine values predominate, though not to the total exclusion of feminine ones. Such a change is not likely as long as we remain under the sway of a political class whose instincts are overwhelmingly feminine.

Another vital requirement is that in looking to curb the abuses of the Welfare State we take an overview in which eugenic considerations are included. If our desire is for a strong nation, we should be seeking the procreation of the best elements among our people and the limitation of the worst elements. The present Welfare State, shaped as its policies are by a sickly liberal sentimentality which completely disregards eugenic considerations, is achieving precisely the opposite. The human trash is breeding while our best stocks are limiting their births. This must change radically.

But given that a different political class emerges, that the masculine instincts are again in the ascendant and that eugenic *desiderata* are constantly taken into account in the shaping of welfare policies, we come to the crucial question: how are those in real need to be sorted out from those not in need? How are the genuinely helpless to be told apart from those who could help themselves but have lacked the character and the stimulus to do so?

This question could take a book to answer if we cared to delve into it in every aspect that deserves consideration. Here, however, it is appropriate to condense things down to one simple formula which will cover most of the cases with which we are dealing, though not of course all of them.

**First and foremost, we must recognise that every able-bodied member of the population must be provided with the opportunity to work.**

As long as this fundamental is lacking — a fundamental right, you could call it — the drive to eliminate the abuses of the Welfare State is going to flounder amid masses of cases of the grossest injustice.

For how can we reasonably say to a man that he must stand on his own feet and support his family by his own efforts when all opportunity to earn an honest living has been taken away from him by an economic system which has reduced vast stretches of his country to industrial deserts?

This is the great question that must be hurled in the face of Conservatives who demand that the nanny state should be dismantled and a tougher, more vigorous national environment created, but who at the same time remain obstinately committed to the dogma of the 'free market'.

A free market whose creators allow the Welsh mining industry to be destroyed in order to let in cheap imported coal then lecture to the redundant men of those valleys

that they must be self-reliant in seeking alternative livelihoods?

And when, furthermore, the investment capital that might provide them with those alternative livelihoods is lacking because its owners can scent richer dividends in the sweat-shops of Singapore and Malaysia!

It should scarcely need a moment's serious reflection for anyone to understand that a society containing the qualities so admired by Mr. Alexander — boldness, vigour, determination, ambition, etc. — can only be recaptured in this country within the framework of an economic system which has abandoned the anarchy of the global free market in favour of a self-contained, planned, organised, and above all nationalist, economy which provides gainful employment in every region of the United Kingdom for every person seeking it.

The first priority in weeding out the parasites from our welfare system is for us to be able to offer work to every would-be welfare claimant. If ample work is available in his or her locality, and of a variety which offers reasonable choice, and the claimant does not take it, we can then reasonably deduce that that claimant is looking for something for nothing. Providing then that the claimant gives no evidence of physical disability, he or she should curtly be told that welfare is refused.

This simply policy would at the same time achieve another valuable objective. It would help to reverse the dysgenic tendency whereby the most useless elements in society are encouraged to breed. The genetically sound would take the work offered them; the genetically unsound would seek ways of evading it and would suffer the penalty.

The tragic paradox of today is that in those very quarters of national politics where, a self-reliant society is most loudly called for there is the greatest fixation with the virtues of 'economic freedom' — the very economic freedom which destroys the national self-reliance that is the first prerequisite for the self-reliance of the individual.

I refer of course to the ranks of British Toryism.

Another writer, John Gray, in *The Times* of June 24th was close to the truth in many respects when he said:-

"Traditional conservatism no longer exists in Britain. It is dead — killed off by the radical market liberalism which the Tories adopted in the late 1970s and which has governed the policies of successive Conservative governments since that time. The aims of traditional conservatism — the nurturing of communities and the renewal of civic institutions in Britain — have been abandoned, and supplanted by a programme of market-driven individualism and permanent institutional revolution. Public policy, animated by neo-liberal ideology, has sought to reconstruct Britain's inheritance of civic institutions on a crudely simplified model of market exchange.

"The upshot of this grand experiment in Tory social engineering has been the destruction of the old ethos throughout the

*Contd. overleaf*



## IN THE BEGINNING MUST BE WORK

(Contd. from prev. page)

intermediary institutions, the professions and the public services, and a continuation, indeed an acceleration, of Britain's economic decline. The desolation of communities and the flouting of norms of fairness and decency which are deeply ingrained in British culture have not produced economic renewal.

"Nor could they have done, since a strong and flourishing market economy cannot be built on a divided and demoralised society in which crime is endemic, and family life neglected and fractured. Instead the Tory philosophy of market fundamentalism has resulted in a sleazy and run-down economy, lacking in skills and beset by short-termism. Even by its own blinkered

criteria, free-market ideology has manifestly failed.

"The failure of market liberalism poses a political dilemma for the Tories which is insoluble. From the 1980s onwards, they have staked everything on an appeal to economic self-interest. The traditional conservative concern with controlling risk and uncertainty in the everyday lives of ordinary people has been cast aside by policies which claim to enhance choice. Typically, the promised enlargement of choice has proved illusory, and has meant only an increase in insecurity, especially about jobs. This insecurity has cut deeply into the Tories' constituencies. It will not diminish even if the present weak and faltering recovery continues, since the new jobs emerging from this recovery are mostly casual, part-time and low-paid."

It is easy enough to pick holes in points of detail in this analysis, but the analysis as a

whole is substantially correct. It is a damning indictment of virtually everything British Conservatism has stood for — not just since the late 1970s, as Mr. Gray would seem to be suggesting — but for most of the present century. Whether the writer would go so far as to accept all the necessary remedies, in particular economic nationalism and autarky, is beside the point here. He has encapsulated admirably the reality of the hopelessness of trying to replace what is sometimes called the 'dependency culture' by conventional Tory methods.

Britain's Welfare State certainly needs a revolution. But this cannot occur effectively except as part of a much wider and deeper revolution in the whole British body-politic and system.

And that is a change that will not be achieved by the old political parties.

# THE LEFTY LIE MACHINE ALIVE AND WELL

**JAMES THURGOOD** looks at a recent example of truth-bending put out by the BNP's opponents

I HAVE always believed that political philosophies which need lies to keep them in business must suffer from some fundamental weakness. So it is with most of the philosophies of the political left. In fact lying, it seems, comes as naturally to people on the left as breathing.

I came across an example of this recently in the form of a leaflet put out by a group calling itself 'Youth Against Racism in Europe'. The leaflet was produced for use at the recent Dagenham by-election, and was clearly designed for the purpose of whipping the voters up against the British National Party, whose leader John Tyndall was standing as BNP candidate. Here are just a few of the porky pies which appeared in the leaflet. Speaking of the BNP, it said:-

**On women's rights:** The BNP think women should stay at home and do all the housework. They would ban contraception and abortion. They think women are inferior to men.

**FACT:** The BNP believes that the woman as mother and housewife is the ideal, as it best suits what most women in their own hearts wish to be themselves. However, the BNP would place absolutely no barriers against women seeking to build careers for themselves if they are really set on it.

We would not ban contraception but we would ban abortion — except in cases where the pregnancy is due to rape or where childbirth is thought by doctors seriously to endanger the would-be mother's life or health.

As for the BNP believing that women are

inferior to men, that is pitiful rubbish. We most certainly do believe men and women to be fundamentally and biologically different, but that both are equal in value. The latter fact is so self-evident as scarcely to need stating — after all, it takes one of each to keep life going!

**On health care:** They (the BNP) want to abolish the NHS and replace it with private hospitals.

**FACT:** The BNP not only wishes to preserve the NHS but would in fact spend much more money on it than is now being spent. This money would come, among other things, from savings in the overseas aid programme. We believe it more important to care for the sick in Britain than in Ethiopia or Rwanda.

We believe there is a place for private hospitals but not at the expense of NHS ones.

**On workers' rights:** They (the BNP) want to smash the trade unions, lower wages and allow bosses to sack workers at will.

**FACT:** We do not want to smash trade unions at all, but we do want to reform them into bodies that will represent all people engaged in productive activity, whether employees, managers or proprietors, with disputes solved through arbitration which is fair to all.

As for lowering wages, this is laughable. It is the BNP, and the BNP alone, which offers an economic system which would enable wages to be progressively raised. We would ban the export of British investment capital to cheap-labour countries, such as

those in the Far East, and we would ban those countries' cut-price exports of goods to Britain. Within a protected home market, in which all British needs in manufactured articles were met from British factories, we could raise British workers' wages because they would not be having to compete in our own market with the products of eastern sweated labour.

Under a BNP Government, laws against unfair dismissal would be firmly upheld — and in some areas strengthened. For instance, public authorities would not be permitted to sack employees because of their political beliefs — as frequently happens now under Labour-controlled borough councils.

**On racism:** They want to provoke a race war where gangs of BNP skinheads would roam the streets murdering anybody who is Black, Asian, Irish, Disabled, a Socialist or is Gay.

**FACT:** This allegation is so puerile it is barely worth dignifying with an answer. The truth is that we want racial peace in Britain, and we believe the best way to get it is the humane and peaceful repatriation of our ethnic minorities to their ancestral homelands. More than just a few ethnic minority members agree with us on this, and we will be glad to work with them to achieve it.

Any BNP member who attacks anyone in the streets without provocation would be severely disciplined and could be expelled.

As for murdering the Irish, tell that to our

Contd. on next page



many Irish members!

**On democracy:** The BNP want to abolish elections and create a nazi dictatorship with John Tyndall as the führer.

**FACT:** Elections would take place in a BNP Britain just as they do now. The difference is that they would be organised on an occupational basis rather than on an area basis. Doctors would vote as doctors and send their representatives to parliament, postmen would vote as postmen and do likewise, and so on. There would be no 'dictatorship' because the Prime Minister, who would be elected directly by the people, could be made to resign and seek re-election by a vote of parliament should he suffer a loss of confidence.

These absurdities aside, the leaflet also claims that the BNP says that "Black and Asian people are to blame for unemployment and bad housing." This is nonsense. The BNP blames unemployment on a bad economic system, particularly where the system lets in cut-price imports from cheap-labour countries, as stated before. We blame bad housing mostly on bad local government, but the state of the economy obviously has an effect here as it leaves less resources for public housing projects.

These things said, of course it must be true that when both jobs and housing are in short supply for the reasons given, the presence of immigrants and their offspring in this country increase the demand and there-

fore aggravate the shortage.

These are the truths of what the BNP stands for. So the next time you see one of

these dirty little leaflets circulating about, don't believe them — their authors are liars and cannot be trusted!



#### THE LEAFLET

The copy here is full of dirt marks. This is because the person who sent it in picked it out of the gutter where, presumably, it had been trodden on a good deal. Note that it says 'Vote Labour'

## THE SNARL BEHIND THE MASK

NOEL A. HUNT warns of future Russian expansionism

*Make ye no truce with Adam-Zab,  
The Bear that walks like a man.*

Rudyard Kipling: *The Truce of the Bear.*

AN ARTICLE in *Foreign Affairs* (Simes, Vol.65, No.3, p.487) states that: "The US, and the West as a whole, may find themselves mesmerised by an impressive Kremlin performance, forgetting that the final act is supposed to be their demise." What follows takes the view that the magazine has it right, further that all the evidence supports its view. We argue that the current Russian line of friendship and co-operation is a huge sham.

History, ethnology and anthropology agree that one of the characteristics of a virile and racially homogeneous people is an urge to expand, to build an empire. This is true of every race and in every historic era.

Russians are Slavs. Slavs are the longest-futured and one of the most enduring and patriotic of the European peoples. Today they are probably the most racially pure of European stocks. Free of her 'ethnic minorities', Russia is the

stronger for it.

The blood-stained history of Russia is proof of the statement above that virile peoples are expansionist. In the 9th and 10th Centuries Russia — the Slavs — fought five wars against Byzantium. During the 13th and 14th centuries they fought 41 wars against Lithuania, 30 wars against the German Baltic states, and 44 wars against Sweden, Bulgaria and other smaller states. In the 16th, 17th and 18th Centuries Russia fought eight wars against the Poles and nine against Sweden. She fought Persia three times between 1722 and 1828. In the 17th century she waged two wars against China. The Empress Catherine fought a war with India; in 1801 her successor Paul began another. She fought Japan in 1904 over Manchuria and invaded Finland in 1941. (Source: *Ivan the Terrible* by Francis Carr, published by David & Charles). In addition, she fought numerous internal wars against other Russian principalities. She has never suffered a long-term large-scale foreign occupation. Hence, the Slav blood remains almost totally pure, and the aggressive Slavic tendencies unalloyed.



#### KRUSCHEV

His threat "We'll bury you" is consistent with Russian policy over the ages.

When President Krushchev told the West: "We will bury you," he meant just

*Contd. overleaf*



## THE SNARL BEHIND THE MASK

(Contd. from prev. page)

what he said. His words reflected not only the ideological view of the Communist Party but that of the Slavs as a people. There is no evidence at all to show that this chauvinist outlook — the hallmark of a virile race — has altered. In fact, the outbursts of Zhirinovsky and his promises to spit in NATO's eye are not, as our press assures us, the ravings of a crazed extremist but express what the average Slav would love to do — and will, if given the chance.

The Russian rulers lie — they always have and they always will. In proof of this, there is the report of the Committee of the Judiciary of the US Senate in 1959. This says, in part: "In the 38 short years since the Soviet Union came into existence its government has broken its word to practically every country to which it ever gave a signed promise. It signed treaties of non-aggression with neighbouring states, and then absorbed those states. It signed promises to refrain from revolutionary activity inside the countries with which it sought friendship, and then cynically broke those promises...It broke the promises it made to Western nations during meetings 'at the summit' in Teheran and Yalt...It keeps no international promises at all unless doing so is clearly advantageous to the Soviet Union." The West keeps every promise made to Russia to the last jot and tittle. Western liberals, implacable haters of their own race and its culture, see to that. This liberal mindset gives Russia an enormous advantage; liberals always urge that Russia be given the benefit of every doubt, call for inaction when what is clearly needed is action, anything rather than admit that Russia lies persistently and brazenly.

### TRADITION OF DECEPTION

Deception has been a Russian speciality since the Empress Catherine and the Potemkin villages. Their word for it is *maskirovka*, roughly "masking." The intention of *maskirovka* is to lull the enemy into a false sense of security, to show apparent weakness where strength exists, to create confusion leading to misunderstanding. These tactics are helped by a spineless West lacking the courage to denounce what it knows to be lies.

Under the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) in 1991 Russia agreed to reduce her nuclear arsenal by over 35 per cent, to halve her SS18 arsenal, to limit Strategic Nuclear Delivery Vehicles to 1,600, to limit ballistic missile warheads to 4,900. Our Ministry of Defence announced that in terms of a treaty Russia would destroy about 100,000 tanks, armoured personnel carriers and pieces of artillery. They were lying.

A year later the Defence Minister told the Commons Defence Select Committee that Russia had moved 58,200 items of

treaty-limited equipment, including 16,400 tanks to hiding places behind the Urals. The number of tanks alone so moved greatly exceeds the combined US and British strength in Europe.

But this happened at the height of the West's lunatic love affair with Gorbachev; so the revelations were ignored. The West, in fact, was "mesmerised by an impressive Kremlin performance." Britain has now taken action. Her action is the production of a plan named 'Options for Change'. It is now being put vigorously into effect. It amounts to unilateral disarmament.

While Britain and America disarm, Russia is arming fast. In 1991 she launched the 95,000 ton carrier *Tiblisi*. Work is in hand on an even larger successor. She has built a new tank, the SMT 89, the Halo helicopter, the Hokum fighter and Havoc, a sophisticated anti-tank weapon. There is much more. The West pretends not to know what Russia is doing.

All this is mad enough; but the West goes even further into folly. Tens of millions are poured into developing former Russian provinces. It is certain that in her own good time, and when the West has done its utmost to develop them, Russia will scoop them into her net.

So openly contemptuous is Russia of the West that she has had the impudence to put forward the Yalinsky Plan. In terms of this, Western governments and the multi-nationals (this term allows us a rare and fleeting glimpse of the guiding hand at work) would over five years, and in return for promises of economic reform, give Russia £15-£30 billion annually. Unbelievably, the plan was taken seriously. The impeccably politically correct *Economist* newspaper remarked, deadpan, that "one way of raising this amount would be to cut Western defence spending by 5 percent."

But all this is really beside the point. True, Russian armament is enormous and will grow steadily. But these facts do not pinpoint the real danger to the West. This danger lies in the patriotic fervour and expansionist urge of the virile Slavic people, to which the West opposes a flabby multi-racialism and a lunatic belief in egalitarianism. Under these circumstances, the Russians would be a terrible threat were they armed with nothing more formidable than spears and bows, reinforced by racial pride and an urge to expand. As matters stand, they can and will stare down a West which is in reality powerless, although it has huge military and economic resources. Lacking the courage and political will to use what it has, the West is for practical purposes defenceless and at the mercy of Russia.

Thus there seems a good chance that for the first fifty years or so of the 21st century Russia will dominate the world. She is likely then to be challenged by China. Nobody can predict the outcome of this mighty clash. This will be of no concern to us; the West and its civilisation, brilliant as it once was,

will be part of the debris of history, killed by the deadly virus of liberalism.

### BOOKS BOOKS BOOKS BOOKS

**American Martyr:** The story of Huey Long (by Gerald L.K. Smith). Price £4.30.

**The press we don't deserve:** Yet more *Searchlight* disinformation exposed. (by Alex Baron). Price £5.30.

**My life:** The autobiography of Sir Oswald Mosley, from the battlefields of the First World War to imprisonment without trial during the Second. Price £5.50.

All prices include postage.

FROM:-

Steven Books  
10 Lincoln Way  
Enfield  
Middlesex EN1 1TE

For the news that the controlled media don't want you to read, subscribe to **THE OAK**. £8.00 U.K.; £10.00 Europe; US\$25.00 air mail rest of world. Oak Publications, BCM Box 6089, London WC1N 3XX.

### Editor's correspondence

As most readers will know, *Spearhead* editor John Tyndall was British National Party candidate in the parliamentary by-election in Dagenham on June 9th. This candidature necessitated Mr. Tyndall being present in the Dagenham area for the election campaign for a large part of the time during May and the first nine days of June.

The result of this time away from his office is that Mr. Tyndall's correspondence schedule has got severely behind. A huge pile-up of letters awaited his return after the election, and over the past seven weeks he has been working hard to answer these letters between attending to many other duties, including the editing of the July and August issues of *Spearhead*. Some letters, however, still remain unanswered. Would those correspondents thus affected please show patience. Their letters will receive replies just as soon as possible.

### FREEDOM VIDEOS

Our new expanded catalogue of nationalist, revisionist and music videos (VHS) is now available.

Send an SAE for full lists to: **Freedom Videos, BM Truth, London WC1N 3XX.**

*National Vanguard* No. 113 (Jan-Feb 1994). £1.55. Cheques/POs only to LIFE RUNE BOOKS, BCM BOX 6089, LONDON WC1N 3XX. Send 2 x 25p stamps or 3 x IRCs for lists.

*Searchlight* Victims' Support Group: Send 3 x first class postage stamps to A.Jones, BM Box 4534, London WC1N 3XX.



# TIME TO STOP GROVELLING

Britain, says MICHAEL BOGGIS, is degrading herself by failing to stand up to her enemies

AS the British Empire has waned and our position in the world has been reduced, our politicians have sought new strategies to meet Britain's 'new' role in the world. The old parties have all done an excellent job of managing our decline. The other day we heard a prominent Labour politician talking on LBC Radio of his assessment of our country as 'middling, knocking on third-rate'. This was not a complaint on his part, but rather his view of what we, the great British people, should consider to be our rightful position in the world. And, have no doubt, this is what Labour will deliver if elected.

The Liberal Democrats seem so grey and insignificant as to be hardly worth mentioning. Suffice to say that they so lack identity and direction that even if they were elected to government they would still cause less of a ripple than the election of one BNP councillor.


And then of course there are our old friends, the Tories. As they have actually been in government for some time, we can examine their deeds to see where they have led us in this world. Under the Tories, our policy towards the rest of the world must have reached its last and lowest incarnation — pure grovelling. 'Grovel' is defined in my Oxford Dictionary as 'lie or crawl face downwards, humble oneself' — in other words 'kow tow'. People love kicking sand in the faces of grovellers, and that has been the return of fifteen years of Tory grovelling for the British People.

Do you remember watching Mrs Thatcher sucking up to President Reagan, and didn't it make you sick? Well, it must have made him sick, because he taught her that grovelling doesn't pay by invading Grenada, where the Queen is Head of State, without even having the courtesy to ask Mrs Thatcher's opinion. Mr Major's government continues its subservience to the USA by accepting a nice room for the night from President Clinton in compensation for Clinton's help to Gerry Adams and the IRA, which will inevitably cost dozens, if not hundreds, of British lives. Is this the sort of deal we should be willing to accept for all our help, loyalty, and dare I say it, grovelling? In return for all we have given America we have received a kick in the teeth and effectively the murder of our people by proxy. America must be taught that British support has a price, and unerring loyalty in return is that price. As it is, we see the Irish Republic, a country which has consistently refused to back America on international issues, treated

with the same status and respect as ourselves. "We still have a special relationship don't we?" says Mr Major to Mr Clinton. "Of course we do" replies Mr Clinton, "just keep grovelling."

Then of course there is that festering sore, the EU, as the Common Market is now known. Here, if we did but realise, is the greatest and most pointless subservience our country has ever suffered. We have given them everything — billions of pounds to be squandered on foreign fraud, our sovereignty and much of our national pride and tradition. We have given away our independence, our most dearly cherished possessions, fought for over centuries and literally to the ends of the earth. And what little did we ever expect in return? Just a few extra export opportunities. We haven't even got those and instead our economy cannot recover from the worst recession in living memory (caused by the ERM fiasco) because we have become too dependent on Europe. A small prize is on offer for anyone who can convincingly tell me why we don't leave the EU tomorrow!

Grovelling to larger powers is bad enough. But when the grovelling is extended to seedy, tacky little nations which we feel we should be squashing under our thumb, then it really does make you wretch. One such nation that immediately springs to mind is the Republic of Ireland. The grovelling to the Irish Republic would be worth a laugh a day if it were not for the fact that it has cost thousands of British lives. At the time of writing, the Irish Prime Minister, a certain Mr Reynolds, is refusing to crack down on terrorists, as mortars, said to be made under factory-like conditions in the Irish Republic, are exported to be fired at Heathrow Airport. In return for our begging Mr Reynolds to crack down honestly on the IRA we are rewarded with waffle about a 'political solution'. Well, why don't we call his bluff? If Mr Reynolds has a card called 'political solution' up his sleeve he should produce it and play it now. He cannot reasonably expect us to settle for anything less than an instant and final solution to the Irish problem in view of the fact that British lives are at stake. If, having been given a short period in which to work his magic, Mr Reynolds should fail, then we should perform the task of completely destroying the IRA and the culture which supports it in Ireland, and replacing it with a much healthier and more positive British culture. This would require us to ignore foreigners' opinions of how we run our own affairs. We would get a few puffs and huffs from the likes of President Clinton and Boutros



**EIRE PREMIER REYNOLDS**  
Our Government treats him as if he were the leader of an important power.

Whathisname, but secretly they would all be very relieved, as would the people of Ireland and the rest of the British Isles. And the world would have a bit more respect for us.

Another individual we have selected lately for a bit of extra-oily grovelling is the singularly unpleasant Dr. Mahathir of Malaysia. Not content with the grovelling of British politicians, diplomats and businessmen, Dr. Mahathir now demands grovelling acquiescence from the British press as well. He has decided to bring us to heel like the good little dogs we are, and so he has effectively cut off most of our exports, like a sort of commercial castration. The grovelling machine duly swung into action. High level grovellers were sent to lick his boots in the lowest, most begging and subservient manner, to reinforce our position as scavengers only too grateful to receive morsels from Malaysia's plate. Andrew Neil, editor of the *Sunday Times*, has been soundly told off by the Government for not effectively accepting censorship by a foreign government. This, improperly subservient position of our country to Malaysia is ongoing. Considering recent press reports, I will not bother to repeat the catalogue of rip-offs this bunch of Third World crooks have perpetrated upon their own people and the British taxpayer. But why do we grovel to Malaysia? We import more from them than we export to them, and theirs is exactly the bowl-of-rice-a-day type of economy which is undermining our own industries. So why didn't we just cut off their exports to us, shut up shop there and think ourselves better off without them? Because, of course, that would need common sense.

*Contd. overleaf*



## TIME TO STOP GROVELLING

(Contd. from prev. page)

We really must stop this constant degradation of our people by our diplomats and governments, and start to realise our real value in the world. The problem is that the cocktail-round and old-school-tie sort of

diplomacy is so ingrained into our establishment that it will take a virtual revolution to change to a commonsense, Britain First system. Under such a system, we should not enter into package deals such as GATT and the EC, as we then have to accept the bad with the good, and the former is always present in much greater abundance than the latter. We should enter into specific

agreements with individual countries and companies, solely judged upon whether such agreements are to the profit and benefit of our community. When it comes to deciding how we run our own affairs, we should remember that there are two types of people in this world — British people and foreigners, and only the former really matter.

# HAS CHRISTIANITY LOST ITS WILL TO SURVIVE?

Some questions for the clergy on Islam, by HARRY WINN

SINCE 1945 the leadership of the Christian Churches in the United Kingdom have either argued for multi-faithism, multi-racialism and multi-culturalism, or they have not spoken out against them.

They have therefore not opposed immigration in any way. Let us look at two typical examples of their position. First, the letter from the Presidents of Churches Together in England, published in *The Times* of 30.3.94, which says:-

"Respect for the humanity we share with each and every neighbour is the only basis for a peaceful and good society. Any attack on the dignity and human rights of any racial or religious groups damages all of us."

Secondly, in the Archbishop of Canterbury's statement on the East London by-election, dated 17th Sept, 1993, which contains:-

"Our Lord's command is to love our neighbours as ourselves. Every human being is equally precious in the sight of God. Christian people should condemn and resist racism by all lawful means."


This is all good stuff, on the surface, but it avoids the one question they have had the moral courage to discuss since 1945, namely what should we do if one group of immigrants to this country wish to destroy Christianity? Let us, for example, look at the ideas of one group as set out by Mervyn Hiskett's book *Some to Mecca Turn to Pray Islamic Values in the Modern World*. Mervyn has given me permission to quote from this:-

"The following are the political objectives of Islam as set out in *Issues in the Islamic Movement*, No 4, pp 48-49, edited by Dr Kalim Siddiqui. These were the conclusions of a seminar held in August 3-6 1983 on 'The State and Politics in Islam' called by Dr Kalim Siddiqui, Director of the Muslim

Institute:-

1. To eliminate all authority other than Allah and his Prophet.
2. To eliminate nationalism in all its shapes and forms, in particular the Nation States.
3. To unite all Islamic movements into a single global Islamic Movement to establish the Islamic state.
4. To reconstruct the world of Islam into a system of Islamic states linked together to express the unity of the world Islamic community.
5. To eliminate all political, economic, social, cultural and philosophical influences of Western civilisation that have penetrated the world of Islam.
6. To re-establish a dominant and global Islamic civilisation based on the concept of the unity of Allah.
7. To create the necessary institutions for the pursuit of that which Allah approves and the forbidding of that of what which Allah disapproved.
8. To establish justice (Sharia Law !?) in all human relationships at all levels throughout the world.

I now wish to issue a challenge to the Presidents of Churches Together in England. Firstly, can any of them find a place for the Christian Church within the ideas of Dr Kalim Siddiqui? Secondly, if they cannot, can they please explain to me why they should not oppose any further Muslim immigration to this country, in order to stop Dr Kalim Siddiqui implementing his ideas and hence the removal of the Body of Christ from the British Isles?



SIDDIQUI

Wants to make Islam dominant

We are now facing a fourth Muslim invasion of Europe. There are two major differences between this one and the previous three. Firstly, the first three were attempted by the sword and this one by immigration. Secondly, the Christian Churches opposed the first three, and they have welcomed this one.

## JOIN THE WELLING CLUB

The Welling Club is a special group that has been formed for the purpose of raising money for the British National Party. Membership is open to all persons, whether or not BNP members, willing to contribute £20 each month to the Party's funds.

In recent years the Welling Club has been a valuable source of regular finance for the BNP, which unlike other political parties does not receive funding from foreign business interests or left-wing trade unions.

Those wishing to join the Welling Club should apply, sending their initial £20 contribution (made out to the British National Party) to: PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.



RACE  
AND  
NATION



The Editor  
'Spearhead'  
PO Box 117  
Welling  
Kent DA16 3DW

## LETTERS

SIR: Were it not for the fact that Britain's membership of the EC has had such a catastrophic effect on our sovereignty, our economy, our relationship with our former Dominions and our national self-respect, Mr. Major's recent antics in Corfu would be the cause of some merriment.

Following in the wake of his 'triumph' at Maastricht and the fact that the Tories were not entirely wiped out in the farcical Euro elections, Major's action of vetoing Jean-Luc Dehaene's election as President of the European Commission on the grounds that Dehaene is too much of a Euro-federalist was predictably hailed as another 'victory'.

Certainly, Mr. Major's rejection of Mr. Dehaene succeeded in silencing the so-called 'anti-federalists' among the Tories (which was the whole purpose of the exercise); but the irony is that his own candidate, the repulsive Sir Leon Brittan, is even more of a Euro-federalist than Mr. Dehaene!

Mr. Major's posturings merely perpetuate the dishonesty and contempt with which the Tories have treated the British people ever since Harold Macmillan applied for membership of Europe. In those days we were told that the EC was simply an economic arrangement between member states.

It is significant that protagonists of Britain's continued membership of the Community now no longer even bother to pretend that the latter's purpose is primarily economic. The 'European Economic Community' has now become the 'European Union'. However, I do not despair for I am convinced that this so-called 'Union' will inevitably be swept into the dustbin of history as surely as were the Hanseatic League and the Zollverein. The sooner the better!

RONALD RICKCORD  
Newport Pagnell, Bucks.

*(Postscript: Since the writing of this letter, Jacques Santer of Luxembourg, whose candidature John Major approved, has been made President of the European Commission. Mr. Santer is, by his own acknowledgement, every bit as committed a Euro-federalist as Jean-Luc Dehaene)*

SIR: There was an interesting article in the *Sunday Telegraph* on the 19th June entitled

'Nice Jewish girls wanted'.

This was about a book written by Chief Rabbi Jonathan Sachs in which the writer describes his concern for the future of the Jewish race due to the high rate of marriages between Jews and non-Jews. Liberalism and multi-culturalism are blamed for this in the article.

I wonder if the same platform would ever be afforded to a white Anglo-Saxon to educate the masses of his own people to the dangers of their racial destruction? I think not. Immediately, this would be described as 'racism', and many of the Jews themselves would be screaming 'nazi'!

Liberalism is a cancer which, as stated in the article, quickly rots a people.

But it seems from the article that the right to reject liberalism and multi-culturalism in favour of racial exclusivity is one that belongs only to the Jews — not to our own people.

D. SUMMERS  
Salford, Lancs.

SIR: No-one over the past couple of months can have been unaware of the 50th anniversary of D-Day. But what lies behind all the hype given to this occasion?

The answer is simple. For the Government, a sanitised version of the past gives a far more favourable impression of what Britain stands for than does the grubby reality of the present. For those people old enough to remember D-Day, the anniversary provokes a powerful nostalgia providing justification for a nationally ruinous war. After all, dwelling upon this 50-year-old victory diverts people from thoughts about Britain sinking from world power to pauper state, with the Empire gone, industry destroyed and our country swamped by alien invaders — all catastrophes that World War II was supposedly fought to prevent!

TONY LECOMBER  
Ilford, Essex

SIR: This Lloyds 'names' business seems rather curious! Why so much disaster after so many profitable years?

I happened to come across an insurance companies' trade journal the other day. The President of some company was reported as giving an address at a banquet at which he was listing insurance frauds perpetrated by Indians — heaps of them. Two that stick in my mind were: (1) A man who was 'drowned' in a reservoir that had been empty for two years; (2) A man who 'died' who had never been born.

As I read on, I was impressed by the speaker's courage. Then just at the end, as if anticipating trouble from the Race Relations Board, he said there were some life insurance frauds perpetrated by people other than Indians!

M.F. INGRAMS  
Orpington, Kent

SIR: The BNP's successes in the recent council elections and the subsequent Dagenham by-election have been spectacular. Congratulations are due to all those who made these possible.

However, what we must be prepared for now are the tactical manoeuvres of those dark and sinister forces which are determined to stop the party.

Not only must we be on the alert against the obvious, such as alleged improprieties in the Millwall ballot, but we must also be on our guard against an old strategy: the one of 'divide-and-conquer', employed with such devastating effect in the 1970s against nationalists. Part of this will no doubt include the setting up of dummy 'parties' aimed at diverting support from the BNP — for example, the 'New Britain' Party, which went defunct after the 1970s and has recently emerged from limbo again.

MALVERN TIPPING  
Framlingham, Suffolk

## How to obtain *Spearhead*

*Spearhead* is available from our office to those who wish to obtain copies for themselves every month and to those who wish to obtain copies for redistribution. Those wanting copies for themselves each month are recommended to take out a subscription by filling in the form below and sending it to us with the applicable sum.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

The following rates are for 12 issues (please tick box where applicable):-

British Isles: £12.65 ☐ Overseas surface mail: £14.75 ☐ Unsealed air mail Europe: £15.70 ☐ Unsealed air mail Middle East, N & S America: £22.10 ☐ Unsealed air mail Australasia, Far East: £23.70 ☐

PLEASE NOTE: These overseas rates apply if remittance is in Pounds Sterling. If remittance is in any other currency, an additional charge of £6.50 is required in the case of cheques and money orders and £2.50 in the case of banknotes, these paying for banker's commission and charges.

Discounts for bulk purchases can be obtained as follows:-

10-19 copies: 56p each; 20-49 copies: 50p each; 50-99 copies: 42p each; 100-199 copies: 35p each; 200-499 copies: 30p each; 500 copies or over: 28p each (For advice on postal rates please contact our office).

All cheques and postal or money orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW. Please do not include a payment for *Spearhead* in a remittance which includes payment for other items.



**AMERICA'S DECLINE: THE EDUCATION OF A CONSERVATIVE** (Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £3.50. A collection of articles and reviews on various aspects of the collapse of modern civilisation. 1981, 375pp.

**ARTHURIAN LEGENDS, THE** £8.95 (paperback only). A beautifully illustrated anthology of Arthurian literature from Geoffrey of Monmouth to T.H. White. A 'must' for lovers of nation legends. 1979, 224pp.

**A WORLD COUP D'ETAT IS PLANNED** (Dr. Kitty Little) 50p. Update to *Treason at Westminster*, giving details of the destructive effects of treaties foisted on Britain. 1984, 66p.

**BABYLONIAN WOE, THE** (David Astle) £17.00. A study of the origin of certain financial practices and their effects on the events of ancient history, written in the light of the present day. 1975, 250pp.

**BARNES TRILOGY, THE** (Harry Elmer Barnes) £2.75. A combined volume containing this famous American revisionist's pamphlets: *Court Historians versus Revisionism*; *Blasting the Historical Blackout and Revisionism and Brainwashing*. These first appeared in 1952, 1963 and 1963 respectively, and this combined edition is dated 1979. 133pp.

**BEHIND THE SCENE** (Douglas Reed) £3.50. A reprint of the second part of the author's *Far and Wide*, published in 1953. The new themes are titled 'Zionism Paramount' and 'Communism Penetrant'. 93pp.

**BEST OF ATTACK AND NATIONAL VANGUARD, THE** £12.00. A selection of hard-hitting nationalist articles published between 1970 and 1982 in two uncompromising American magazines. 217 large pages.

**BIOLOGY OF THE RACE PROBLEM, THE** (Prof. W.C. George) £1.00. The race equality hoax destroyed by an academic expert. 70pp.

**BOUND TO FAIL** (Sundry authors) £2.00. A series of articles by various experts covering every aspect of Britain's disastrous membership of the EEC. 1987, 62pp.

**BRITAIN'S FUTURE: INDEPENDENCE OR EXTINCTION** (Prof. Stephen Bush) £1.00. A strong plea for British independence from EC bureau-crazy. 1990, 19pp.

**CAMP OF THE SAINTS, THE** (Jean Raspail) £5.00. A welcome reissue of this sensational novel about the destruction of the white race by Asian immigrant invasion. 1973, 311pp.

**CHURCHILL'S WAR** (David Irving) £16.95. The highly controversial story of Britain's World War II leader during the late pre-war and wartime years. This book was shunned by all the 'establishment' publishers on account of its startling disclosures. Churchill-worshippers and believers in the 'orthodox' version of modern history will not like this book, as it describes its central character as the man who ruined Britain and the British Empire in his insane vendetta against Hitler. 1987, 591pp.

**CHURCHILL: THE END OF GLORY** (John Charmley) £30.00. This massive work follows in the footsteps of David Irving in his *Churchill's War* in its demolition of the myth of Churchill as a great national leader. The author is in fact less personally scathing in his treatment of his subject than is Irving, even stating that Churchill was a 'great man'. Nevertheless, the book highlights our war Premier's overweening personal ambition and is particularly critical of his failure to come to an agreement with Hitler after British forces had been defeated in Europe in 1940. A valuable new contribution to revisionist history. 1993, 742pp.

**COLLAPSE OF BRITISH POWER, THE** (Correlli Barnett) £10.99. A welcome reissue of a vitally important book first published in 1972. Shows how liberalism and lack of political realism brought about Britain's 20th century decline in the political, industrial and military fields. 643pp.

**CONSPIRACY OR DEGENERACY?** (Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £4.00. Text of a lecture by the author, a brilliant classical scholar, to New England rally for God, Family and Country 1966. 76pp.

**CONTROL OF THE COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA AND CONDITIONING OF THE PUBLIC MIND** (Col. B.S. Turner) £9.75. An updated version of articles appearing in *On Target* newsletter. Packed with facts about the ownership of the media and their political bias. 1992, 34pp (A4).

**CONTROVERSY OF ZION, THE** (Douglas Reed)

*Here is the latest list of our books. The prices given in each case do not include postal charges, which should be estimated by calculating one eighth the total value of the order. Money should be enclosed with all orders, and all cheques or postal orders should be made out to the BNP Book Service only and not included in remittances sent for other items. Orders are likely to be dealt with more quickly if BNP Book Service is marked on the envelope.*

*New titles are marked with stars.*

£14.50. A best seller in nationalist circles ever since its publication. A study of Jewish-Gentile relations since biblical times, packed with little known and long suppressed facts. 1979, 580pp.

**DEADLIER THAN THE H-BOMB** (Leonard Young) £2.00. A reprint of an important work on the money power and its threat to the freedom of mankind. The author was a distinguished RAF officer and active nationalist. 1956 (rep. 1992), 72pp.

**DEALING INN HATE: THE DEVELOPMENT OF ANTI-GERMAN PROPAGANDA** (Dr. Michael F. Connors) £2.50. The writer destroys the fallacy of a warlike Germany and examines the methods used to promote the myth. 1966, 40pp.

**DID SIX MILLION REALLY DIE?** (Richard Harwood) £1.00. The fact-filled pamphlet that refutes the holocaust legends and has evoked Zionist frenzy. 28pp.

**DISPOSSESSED MAJORITY, THE** (Wilnot Robertson) £7.50. This book has attracted worldwide attention, dealing as it does with racial problems in America — and not just simply the black-white situation. 2nd edition 1981, 613pp.

**ÉLITE, THE** (Barbara Cole) £11.75. The exciting story of the Rhodesian Special Air Service and its campaign against terrorism. 1984, 449pp.

**ENEMY OF EUROPE, THE** (Francis Parker Yockey & Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £6.00. Thought-provoking essay on the powers set on destroying the European peoples, written by Yockey and accompanied by a review of Yockey's work by Prof. Oliver. 1981, 240pp.

**FORCED WAR, THE** (David L. Hoggan) £21.00. Described by Harry Elmer Barnes as "...the first thorough study of responsibility for the causes of the Second World War...the definitive revisionist work on the subject." 1989, 732pp.

**FRAUDULENT GOSPEL, THE** (Bernard Smith) £5.95. The third edition of a devastating exposé of the World Council of Churches and its support for communism and terrorism. 1991, 168pp.

**FRENCH REVOLUTION, THE** (Nesta Webster) £6.00. A much needed reprint of the counter-revolutionary classic that exposed the plotting behind the first great revolutionary bloodbath of modern history. 1919 (rep. 1988), xiv, 519pp.

**FROM ROME TO MAASTRICHT** (Brian Burditt, Mark Baimbridge and Stephen Reed) £1.50. A reappraisal of Britain's membership of the European Community — from the Campaign for an Independent Britain. 1992, 69pp.

**GLOBAL MANIPULATORS, THE** (Robert Eringer) £2.50. While the author repudiates any conspiratorial view of world events, he still provides a comprehensive exposure of the organisation and influence of the Bilderberg Group and the Trilateral Commission. 1980, 95pp.

**GLOBAL TYRANNY... STEP BY STEP** (William F. Jasper) £12.50. How the UN is being developed as an omnipotent global government, suppressing national identities and human rights. The author is senior editor of *The New American* and a John Birch Society officer. 1992 xvii, 350pp.

**GOODBYE OZ CULTURE** (Nicholas Maine) £3.50. A hard-hitting exposure of the perils facing Australia from non-white immigration and of the establishment lies being used to promote it. The author is an active campaigner against the betrayal of our brother nation. 1990, 125pp.

**GRAND DESIGN, THE** (Douglas Reed) £2.25. A behind-the-scenes look at modern world history. 1977, 45pp.

**GREAT HOLOCAUST TRIAL, THE** (Michael A. Hoffmann II) £4.00. Extremely comprehensive and well-written report on the infamous trial of Ernst Zundel in Canada, also covered in *The Zundel Trial and Free Speech*. 1985, 95pp.

**HIDDEN MENACE TO WORLD PEACE** (James Gibb Stuart) £10.00. This latest work by a well-known advocate of monetary reform deals also with secret politics, media censorship and the movement towards a 'new world order'. 1993, 233pp.

**HITLER'S WAR** (David Irving) £25.00. A revised and abridged version of *The War Path: Hitler's Germany 1933-39 and Hitler's War* (1977 ed.). 1991, VI, 857pp.

**HOAX OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY, THE** (Prof. A.R. Butz) £5.95. A scientist applies clinical methods to an investigation of the 'holocaust' and completely dissects the myth. 2nd edition 1977, 315pp.

**HOLOCAUST ON TRIAL, THE** (Robert Lenski) £14.20. The story of Ernst Zundel's second trial, with illustrations and verbatim extracts from the transcript. 1990, iv, 544pp.

**HOLOCAUST STORY AND THE LIES OF ULYSSES, THE** (Paul Rassinier) £7.75. A socialist ex-inmate of Buchenwald and Dora concentration camps destroys the holocaust legend. Rassinier was decorated for his work in the French Resistance, so this is one revisionist they can't smear. 1978, xviii, 447pp.

**INNOCENT IN DACHAU** (Joseph Halow) £13.00. A revisionist view of the Dachau war crimes trials by a Lebanese American who served as a court reporter. The book is based on the author's own experiences and on subsequent archival research. 1993, IV, 337pp.

**I.Q. AND RACIAL DIFFERENCES** (Prof. Henry Garrett) £1.20. Clear and concise summary of the evidence of racial differences in intelligence and their significance in education. 1980, 57pp.

**IRON CURTAIN OVER AMERICA** (John Beatty) £7.80. Describes how America's foreign policy was distorted by minority interests. Contains important chapters on the Second World War, the communisation of China and the Middle East. 1951, 267pp.

**IS THE DIARY OF ANNE FRANK GENUINE?** (Robert Faurisson) £2.75. Reprinted from *The Journal of Historical Review*, this is a critical commentary on an emotive historical document. 1982, 62pp.


**IS THERE INTELLIGENT LIFE ON EARTH?** (Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £4.00. An entertaining survey of modern fallacies and their charlatan promoters. 1983, 94pp.

**THE LEMMING FOLK** (James Gibb Stuart) £7.95. A witty and factual examination of current attitudes and intellectual fashions that are threatening our future. 1980, 246pp.

**LEUCHTER REPORT, THE** (Fred A. Leuchter) £5.00. The evidence on 'gas chambers' by an American engineer that rocked the Zundel trial. Leuchter, in effect, testified that such installations could not have existed in German occupied Europe before or during 1939-45. 1988, 66pp.

**MAMMON VERSUS GOD** (Dr. Kitty Little) £1.00. Describes how financial interests are promoting the destruction of nationhood. 1993, 30pp.

**MERRIE ENGLAND, 2000** (Colin Jordan) £1.00. A





fictional portrayal of life at the start of the coming century, with white people under the lash of the racial 'harmonisers'. 1993, 39pp.

**MIGHT OF THE WEST, THE** (Laurence R. Brown) £12.00. An American engineer-scholar gives a new interpretation of the history of western civilisation, showing the importance of the mediaeval contribution to philosophy and science, and showing that the decline of the West is not historically inevitable, as some would teach us. 1963, vii, 562pp.

**MONEY BOMB, THE** (James Gibb Stuart) £4.25. Discusses the failure of our debt-based financial system and describes its role in creating inflation. 1983, 158pp.

**NAKED CAPITALIST, THE** (W. Cleon Skousen) £4.80. A study of the political power and ambitions of America's and the world's financial capitalists and of their link-up with communism. 1970, 144pp.

**NAMELESS WAR, THE** (Capt. A.H.M. Ramsay) £6.50. An outline of the secret history of the events leading up to the Second World War, including information on previous upheavals. The author had the honour of being imprisoned without trial for four years during World War II, despite his status as a member of parliament. Originally published 1952, 128pp.

**NATIONAL SUICIDE: MILITARY AID TO THE SOVIET UNION** (Anthony Sutton) £6.80. Shows quite conclusively that Soviet military technology is a creation of American aid. Exposes the myth of American 'anti-communism'. 1973, 83pp.

**NEW UNHAPPY LORDS, THE** (A.K. Chesterton) £6.00 hardback. An exposure of the financial power that seeks to drag mankind into a global police state. 1972, 288pp.

**NO TIME FOR SILENCE** (Austin J. App) £4.75. Reprints of 14 revisionist pamphlets published between 1946 and 1978. The late author taught English literature at several US universities and colleges. 1987, iv, 143pp.

**OTHER LOSSES** (James Bacque) £4.50. Startling exposures by a French Canadian writer of the maltreatment and deaths suffered by German POWs under Eisenhower's occupying US troops after World War II. 1989, 230pp.

**POPULISM AND ELITISM** (Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £4.00. A study of the purpose and function of political power and the elements which wield it in the present century. 1982, 101pp.

**RACE** (J.R. Baker) £25.00 hardback. The author, a professional zoologist for 50 years, provides an objective and scholarly account of what race means and how the concept has affected human thinking. A specialist book, but one of great importance. 1974, 625pp.

**RACE, INTELLIGENCE AND EDUCATION**. 50p. produced by a group of nationalist teachers in reply to an NUT race-mixing booklet. Packed with facts and cogent argument. 1979, 20 A4 pages.

**RACE AND POLITICS** (H.B. Isherwood) 50p. Shows that a sense of racial identity is an essential element of nationhood. 1974, 36pp.

**RACE AND REALITY** (Carlton Putnam) £4.00. A companion volume and supplement to *Race and Reason*, showing how the truth about the race issue has been suppressed by interested parties. 1967 (rep. 1977),

192pp.

**RACE AND REASON** (Carlton Putnam) £4.00. A plain, unemotional account of the race issue that has been an invaluable contribution to the debate ever since it was first published. 1961 (rep. 1977), 125pp.

**RED PATTERN OF WORLD CONQUEST** (Eric Butler) £3.75. A distinguished Australian patriot shows that the advance of communism has been assisted by the weakness and treachery of western leaders. New ed. 1985, 115pp.

**RELIGION AND THE RACIAL CONTROVERSY** (H.B. Isherwood) 50p. Shows that racial integration is not ordained by Christianity but that the reverse is true. 1970, 16pp.

**SABOTAGE AND TORTURE** (Barbara Cole) £12.00. The story of the framing and maltreatment of white airmen in Robert Mugabe's 'Zimbabwe'. 1988, 209pp.

**SELF-DETERMINATION? THE QUESTION ULSTER MUST ANSWER** (Richard Cameron) £5.99. The author's solution of self-determination for Ulster under the Crown may be contentious, but the book makes plain the neglect and mismanagement to which the province has been subjected by direct rule. 1992, 192pp.

**SEXUAL DEAD-END** (Stephen Green) £9.95. A factual and scientific description of the threat to personal and social health posed by homosexuality, with an account of the rise of the 'Gay Liberation' movements and 'Gay' activism. This book is not sensationalist but neither is it for the squeamish or easily shocked. 1992, 482pp.

**SIX MILLION RECONSIDERED, THE** (W. Grimstad) £2.50. Examines not only the 'holocaust' but other topics involved in the Jewish Question, including the exploitation of the 'anti-semitic' smear. 1977, 170pp.

**SPECTRE OF POWER** (Malcolm Ross) £6.00. The campaigning Canadian schoolteacher describes the vendetta against him by a powerful minority. 1987, 165pp.

**STLAIN'S WAR** (Ernst Topich) £13.00. A revisionist view of the origins of World War II by an Austrian professor of philosophy. 1987, 152pp.

**STATE SECRETS** (Count. Leon de Poncins) £3.50. A study of some little known state documents that throw much light on recent history. 1975, 191pp.

**STRUGGLE FOR WORLD POWER, THE** (George Knappfer) £6.20. The fourth edition of a work by a distinguished Russian author dealing with the communist and financial conspiracies and showing the link between the two. 1986, 240pp.

**SURVIVAL OF BRITAIN, THE** (Bryan B. Monahan) £7.80. A series of articles from the *Social Creditor* dealing with political and economic threats to Britain's survival and offering solutions to the problem of inflation. 1971, viii, 124pp.

**THOUGHT CRIMES: THE KEEGSTRA CASE** (Doug Christie) £2.40. The text of Doug Christie's courtroom defence of the persecuted Canadian schoolteacher Jim Keegstra. 1986, 34pp.

**TOO BRIGHT THE VISION?** (Arthur Lewis) £7.99. The reminiscences of a valiant clergyman who upheld

the causes of Christianity and civilised rule in Rhodesia. Despite being born in the UK, the author had the honour of being barred from this country by the Wilson régime. 1992, viii, 279pp.

**TORPEDO RUNNING** £5.00. An illustrated magazine-sized survey of the writing career of historian David Irving. xii, 14pp.

**TRADITIONALISTS' ANTHOLOGY** (Compiled by Elizabeth Lady Freeman) £9.00. A fascinating collection of quotations from a wide variety of writers, many of which are of direct relevance to the nationalist cause. 1986, 185pp.

**TREASON AT WESTMINSTER** (Dr. Kitty Little) £1.00. Text of a memorandum to the Royal Commission on Criminal Procedure entitled: *Infiltration of the Government by members of subversive or criminal organisations for the purpose of furthering the interests of those organisations*. 1979, 24pp.

**USES OF RELIGION, THE** (Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £1.00. Examines the value of religion as a socially cohesive force. 1982, 36pp.

**VENTILATIONS** (Wilmot Robertson) £4.50. The sequel to the same author's widely acclaimed *The Dispossessed Majority*. Revised edition 1982, 113pp.

**VICTIM OF THE HOLOCAUST** (Hans Peter Rullman) £3.50. The story of the framing of John Demjanjuk. 1987, 78pp.

**WALL STREET AND THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION** (Anthony C. Sutton) £6.80. The links between Wall Street finance and the Russian Revolution are proved beyond all question by an established scholar. 1974, 228pp.

**WALL STREET AND THE RISE OF HITLER** (Anthony C. Sutton) £6.80. A book that has aroused considerable controversy among nationalists by its suggestion that Hitler had big financial backing from Wall Street. The author is an expert on the links between finance and politics. Read what he says and decide for yourself. 1976, 220pp.

**WAR LORDS OF WASHINGTON** (Curtis B. Dall) £2.60. In an interview with Anthony J. Hilder, Roosevelt's son-in-law exposes FDR's responsibility for Pearl Harbour. n.d., 45pp.

**WEALTH, VIRTUAL WEALTH AND DEBT** (Frederick Soddy) £10.00. The author, a Nobel prize-winner in chemistry, points the way to a satisfactory and beneficial financial system. A long-established classic. 1926 (Rep. 1983), 320pp.

**ZIONIST CONNECTION, THE** (Alfred M. Lilienthal) £13.00. The second edition of a sensational exposure by a non-Zionist Jew of Zionist power politics. 1982, 904pp.

**ZIONIST FACTOR, THE** (Ivor Benson) £10.40. New and much improved edition of a book first published in 1986. A study of the Jewish presence in 20th century history, covering such events as the Bolshevik Revolution, the creation of Israel, the fall of Rhodesia and the relationship between communism and capitalism. 1992, iii, 205pp.

**ZIONIST TERROR NETWORK, THE** £2.00. A 12 page report on the murderous activities in the United States of the Jewish Defence League, compiled by the staff of the Institute for Historical Review.

## PUBLICITY MATERIAL

Except where otherwise stated, the items listed below should be ordered from PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.

### A New Way Forward

A summary of the main political objectives of the British National Party. 79p post-free.

### Fight Back!

British National Party manifesto for the recent 1992 election. Policies are exactly as outlined in *A New Way Forward* (above) but with different title, cover design and introduction. 79p post-free.

### Where We Stand

A new, abridged and bang up-to-date statement of BNP policies. Standard information brochure sent to enquirers. 29p post-free.

### No to Maastricht! No to Europe!

Brand-new booklet outlining the British National Party case against the EC and in particular against the Maas-

tricht Treaty. Produced out of collaboration between BNP Devon Branch and party headquarters. 59p post-free.

### The Enemy Within

This BNP booklet is about the role of the BBC as a weapon of mass brainwashing. The booklet comprises the text of an official complaint by the party to the Broadcasting Complaints Commission following the odious *Public Eye* programme shown in January 1993. Although the complaint is about one specific TV programme, its general drift could be said to apply to a wide range of anti-nationalist propaganda on TV and radio. 44p post-free.

### BNP Activists' Handbook

This is the publication that so many have been waiting for. The Handbook is a comprehensive instruction course in all the essential techniques needed in promoting and building the British National Party at local branch level, starting from scratch when the activist is entirely alone. This booklet is a mine of information that all activists, old and new, will find

valuable in the quest to make their activities more efficient and effective. It is a 'must' for everyone who wants to be more than just an armchair nationalist. The Handbook is illustrated and runs to 71 pages. £1.86 post-free.

### BNP Election Manifesto 1983

Booklet outlining the policies on which the British National Party fought the 1983 general election. Entitled *Vote for Britain* (23pp). 49p post-free.

### BNP Badges

British National Party badges with logo in red, white and blue. £1.25 post-free.

### BNP Key Rings

Key rings with attachment bearing BNP logo in red, white and blue. £1.75 post-free.

### BNP Cloth Logo

BNP logo in cloth, also in red, white and blue. Ideal

Contd. overleaf



for sowing onto anoraks, etc. £1.50 post-free.

### BNP Leaflets

**Defend Rights for Whites!** Leaflet rallying white people to defend their heritage and oppose multi-racialism. The leaflet looks at the effect of multi-racialism on Law and Order, Housing, Health Care, Employment, Education and Social Welfare. It also deals with the treasonable role of the mass media in promoting multi-racial Britain. This leaflet is larger than the standard BNP product. Text and illustrations cover two sides of an A4 format, which is to be folded into three panels each side. £10.00 per 1,000, with postage charges of £5.00 per 1,000.

**Vote British National Party.** This leaflet focuses on the BNP election victory in Tower Hamlets in September 1993 and stresses how this has changed the entire face of British politics, saying that now the BNP has shown that it can win elections it has a new credibility and a vote for it undoubtedly counts. The leaflet also gives a brief synopsis of the main policies on which the party will be fighting forthcoming elections. This is recommended as an excellent election 'warm-up' leaflet. It should be used as a supplement to, not a substitute for, the standard personalised candidate's leaflet. The leaflet contains a photograph of BNP Councillor Derek Beackon at his moment of victory.

**Join the British National Party.** This leaflet is on a similar theme to the above-mentioned 'Vote...' leaflet, dealing likewise with the Tower Hamlets victory. However, it is designed primarily for recruitment purposes rather than for electioneering. It also contains the Derek Beackon victory photograph.

**Rebuild Britain NOW!** Fairly new leaflet. Deals mostly with measures needed to revive the British economy and restore full employment, but also mentions the effect on British jobs of the coloured invasion.

**Join us!** Highly successful recruiting leaflet designed for BNP Autumn and Winter 1992 and Spring 1993 recruitment campaigns. Gives brief account of best-known BNP policies. A summons to battle!

**Immigration: the time to say STOP!** Leaflet drawing attention to the still large numbers of immigrants coming into Britain and calling for repatriation.

**Violent crime in Britain: the horrifying truth.** Deals with muggings, rapes and other violent attacks on defenceless people, giving examples of specific cases. Calls for much tougher treatment of violent criminals.

**Hang child murderers!** Very powerful leaflet calling for the death penalty for the killers of little children.

**Stop unemployment... Ban imports!** Up-to-date leaflet dealing with the effect on British jobs of unrestricted imports of goods that can and should be produced in Britain by British workers. Contains photo of pithead

## BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY



## ACTIVISTS' HANDBOOK

A 'MUST' FOR ALL NATIONALISTS  
The BNP Activists' handbook, at long last published and available. For details, see page 17.

scene and is especially suitable for distribution to coal miners threatened with redundancy through planned pit closures.

**Stand by Ulster!** Leaflet supporting Loyalists in Northern Ireland and listing BNP policies for the province.

**Election warm-up leaflet.** This leaflet has been prepared specially for areas where the BNP plans to put up candidates for elections, whether parliamentary or local government. It precedes the final leaflet bearing the candidate's name, and is designed for 'warm-up' purposes. Based on the 'Rights for Whites' theme, it is especially valuable for areas where immigration and race are a big issue.

**Wake up Scotland!** Leaflet specially designed to bring the BNP message to Scotland.

These leaflets cost £4.50 per 1,000, with postage charges of £4.50 for 1,000 and £5.00 for 2,000.

### BNP Recordings

**Rally '93.** Video-recording of the latest BNP Annual Rally, staged just outside London on November 6th 1993. Hear and see speeches by John Morse, David Bruce, Kirk Lyons, Claude Cornilleau and John Tyndall. Excellent quality of film!

**Rally '92.** Video-recording of BNP Annual Rally in London on October 24th 1992. Hear and see speeches by Syd Carthew, John Peacock, Ken Henderson, Claude Cornilleau, David Bruce, Sam Dickson, Richard Edmonds and John Tyndall.

**Rally '91.** Video-recording of BNP Annual Rally in London on October 12th 1991. Hear and see speeches by Steve Tyler, Scott McLean, Ken Henderson, Eddy Butler, Tony Wells, Dr. Donald Clarke, Richard Edmonds and John Tyndall.

**Rally '90.** Video-recording of BNP Annual Rally in London on October 13th 1990. Hear and see speeches by David Bruce, Steve Cartwright, John Peacock, Karl Philipp, Tony Wells, Steve Smith, Richard Edmonds and John Tyndall.

**Rally '89.** Video-recording of BNP Annual Rally in London on October 14th 1989. Hear and see speeches by Mark Wilson, John Peacock, Gus McLeod, Tony Morgan, David Bruce, Harry Mullin, Richard Edmonds and John Tyndall.

**Rally '87.** Video-recording of BNP Annual Rally in London on October 31st 1987. Hear and see speeches by Ronald Rickcord, Ian Sloan, Gus McLeod, Dr. Peter Peel, Richard Edmonds, Stanley Clayton-Garnett, David Bruce and John Tyndall.

Videos cost £12.00 plus 98p p&p.

### Allied publications

We recommend the following two publications which, although not connected with the British National Party, reflect a broadly similar viewpoint on national and international issues:-

#### CANDOUR

British views letter, founded by A.K. Chesterton to defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance. Subscription: UK £15.00 per year; Overseas £20.00 per year; U.S.A \$30.00 per year. Obtainable from: Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants. GU33 7DD.

#### THE TRUTH AT LAST

Hard-hitting paper for American and other white race patriots. Send a £5 note for a six-month trial subscription to: PO Box 1211, Marietta, Georgia 30061, U.S.A.

## EMERGENCY FUND: TARGET REACHED!

Dear Reader,

You didn't let us down! We were absolutely overwhelmed by the response to the special Emergency Fund appeal launched on behalf of the British National Party last month. I asked party supporters to help us raise money to meet a target of £10,000. I never expected that we would achieve this in only one month — but we did! This was mainly due to a very large donation sent in by one supporter, who wishes to remain anonymous. I have sent my thanks to this donor by way of a personal message through a colleague, and I again repeat this message of thanks here. This donation, together with other generous ones, have enabled us to reach our target very quickly with something to spare. This means that the finances of the BNP should be stable until well into next year and that we shall now be able to pay for a number of projects that we have had in the pipeline for the promotion of the party but which have had to be placed in suspension because of shortage of funds.

In acknowledging our debt of gratitude to the special donor mentioned, we should not neglect to thank all those others who have contributed, some of them very generously. Well done everybody!

JOHN TYNDALL (Leader BNP)

## Production Editor needed

For the past year or so, *Spearhead* and its companion publication *British Nationalist* have enjoyed the services of a Production Editor, who has undertaken a large part of the production work on the former and the whole of that work on the latter. This has been of enormous benefit to *Spearhead's* Editor by way of freeing him for other duties.

Our Production Editor has now informed us of his wish to move to full-time employment outside politics and we must look for a replacement.

The work will require typing ability and familiarity with the 'Word Perfect' typesetting system, as well as involving the pasting up of columns and headings. In the case of *BN* it will also involve assisting the editor by the writing of some of the articles, so that some journalistic experience and ability are very necessary.

The post will be a paid one but the payment will not be high.

The applicant's place of residence is not of prime importance. Applications should be sent to the editor of *British Nationalist*, PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.



# TYNDALL IN SCOTLAND

## Glasgow meeting generates great enthusiasm

GLASGOW was the scene of an excellent British National Party rally last month, the first major one for some time. Despite the rally coinciding with the peak holiday season for the area, just under 80 were in attendance, nearly all of them from Glasgow itself or nearby.

The first speaker was Scottish Organiser Scott McLean, who reported on the recent progress the party had made in Scotland. He was followed by Harry Mullin, who gave a stirring and at times amusing address in his own inimitable style, speaking of his recent experiences living in Ulster.

The final and main speech was made by party leader John Tyndall, who had travelled up from the south for the event. Mr. Tyndall began with a summary of the tremendous progress the BNP had made in the past year, particularly in the way of its election results. He went on to speak of the way in which Glasgow's traditional industrial structure, resting largely on shipbuilding and heavy engineering, had been wilfully destroyed by the internationalist free trade policies of successive governments and how this would need to be restored by way of a 'Buy British' policy which kept out cut-price imports, particularly from Japan and elsewhere in the Far East.

Mr. Tyndall dealt with the growing alien presence in Glasgow, which he had seen on the streets during his latest visit. He spoke of local 'anti-racists' who had tried to harass the BNP, in particular the self-styled 'Scottish-Asian' Action Committee. To loud applause he proclaimed that there was no such person as a 'Scottish Asian' — there were only Scots and Asians, who were totally different.

The BNP leader strongly condemned recent government appeasement of Irish republicans in pursuit of its latest 'peace' initiative, and he raised the biggest cheer of the afternoon when he said that the day peace will once and for all come to Northern Ireland will be when every IRA activist and hanger-on is six feet under the ground. This, he said, is the objective by which Britain should seek an end to conflict in the province.

Mr. Tyndall ended by speaking of the tremendous future awaiting the BNP if present progress could be sustained. The viciousness towards the party on the part of its enemies, he said, was just a symptom of

their feeling of weakness and fear in the face of its advance. Speaking scathingly of those many enemies, he brought the audience to its feet with his closing words: "Where they have destroyed, we shall build again. Where they have betrayed, we shall be

loyal. Where they have surrendered, we shall stand and fight. Where they have degraded and humiliated Britain, we shall lead Britain back to greatness and to glory!"

The meeting was ably chaired by George Hendry. The collection and literature sales raised some very welcome revenue for the branch.

### HARRY MULLIN SPEAKS



## BNP Annual Rally 1994 LONDON

This is to give notice to all British National Party members and other nationalists wishing to attend this year's Annual Rally that the rally will be held on a Saturday in November, probably either the 5th or the 12th of the month.

By next issue it is hoped that we will be in a position to give the exact date. For the moment, please try to keep Saturdays in November free as far as possible!

## SUPPORT FUND

Income from the sales of our magazine is not enough to cover production and administrative costs. We therefore rely on regular donations from our supporters so that we may remain solvent.

Because of the controversial nature of the opinions expressed in these columns, we have found it impossible to induce wholesale distributors to handle our magazine. It is therefore not to be found on sale in high street newsagents or bookshops. Hence our need for additional financial support.

Please send all contributions to: PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW. Please note that receipts are not normally sent for donations of less than £10 unless specifically requested, in which case an SAE would be appreciated.

### Be damned!

A reader has correctly pointed out that the title of this editor's article in the June issue should have contained an *umlaut* over the German word typeset as *dammerung* — so the latter would read as *dämmerung*. We apologise for this error, which was due to haste rather than ignorance!



**ISLINGTON & CAMDEN**  
BM Box 3958, London WC1N 3XX

**EAST LONDON**  
PO Box 300, Emma Street,  
Hackney, London E2 7BZ

**HILLINGDON**  
PO Box 390, Uxbridge,  
Middlesex UB8 3BA

**RICHMOND-UPON-THAMES**  
PO Box 94, Teddington,  
Middlesex TW11 9EY

**CROYDON & MERTON**  
PO Box 301, Carshalton,  
Surrey SM5 4QW

**SOUTH EAST LONDON**  
PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW

**EPPING FOREST**  
PO Box 12, Loughton, Essex IG10 2DN

**WEST KENT**  
PO Box 48, Tonbridge TN11 9JF

**EAST KENT**  
PO Box 8, Ashford TN23 2EL

**WATFORD**  
BM Box 1245, London WC1N 3XX

**MILTON KEYNES**  
PO Box 811, Bradwell Common,  
Milton Keynes, Bucks. MK13 8YZ

**BEDFORD**  
PO Box 174, Kempston,  
Bedford MK42 8EQ

**CAMBRIDGE**  
PO Box 817, Waterbeach,  
Cambridge CB5 9JR

**BERKSHIRE & NORTH HANTS.**  
BCM Box 4110, London WC1N 3XX

**ISLE OF WIGHT**  
PO Box 7, Ventnor, I.O.W. PO38 1RA

**DEVON**  
PO Box 160, Exeter EX1 3YY

**CARDIFF**  
PO Box 632, Cardiff CF2 1UU

**GWENT**  
PO Box 8, Tredegar NP2 3YG

**BIRMINGHAM**  
PO Box 771, Great Barr,  
Birmingham B44 9LZ

**BIRMINGHAM SOUTH**  
PO Box 3592, Kings Norton  
Birmingham B30 9HZ

**WEST BROMWICH**  
PO Box 3398, West Bromwich B70 0LA

## Contact your local party unit!

*THE BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY is  
organised into active units extending over  
most of the United Kingdom. Here we give a  
list of the main units.*

**WORCESTER**  
PO Box 229, Worcester WR2 4SU

**CANNOCK**  
PO Box 3, Cannock WS11 2AF

**STOKE-ON-TRENT**  
PO Box 312, Hanley, Staffs. ST1 0SG

**NORTHAMPTONSHIRE**  
PO Box 45, Wellingborough NN8 3HE

**LEICESTER**  
PO Box 148, Leicester LE3 2YD

**NOTTINGHAM**  
PO Box 2, Carlton, Nottingham NG4 3EQ

**MANSFIELD & ASHFIELD**  
PO Box 20, Mansfield, Notts. NG19 6HP

**CHESTERFIELD**  
PO Box 174, Chesterfield,  
Derbyshire S40 1FP

**LINCOLN**  
PO Box 57, Lincoln LN5 7RQ

**LIVERPOOL**  
PO Box 116, Liverpool L69 1SH

**WARRINGTON**  
c/o PO Box 16, Salford M6 7PT

**MANCHESTER & SALFORD**  
PO Box 16, Salford M6 7PT

The BNP also has units in Hounslow & Staines, Redbridge, Newham, Barking & Dagenham, Havering, Basildon, Southend-on-Sea, Isle of Sheppey, Woking, Southampton, Reading, Gloucestershire, Bristol & Bath, Bournemouth, Stevenage, Enfield & South Herts., Stourbridge, Coventry, Grantham, Derby, Ilkeston, North Wales, Bolton & Bury, Ashton-under-Lyme, Batley, York, Skipton, Tees-side, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Stirling & Alloa, Fife, Cumbernauld, Clydebank, Greenock, Dumbarton, Lanarkshire, Ayr, Cumnock (Ayrshire) and Inverness. If you want to make contact with any of these units, or start a new unit, please write to BNP Head Office at PO Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.

**ROCHDALE**  
PO Box 118, Rochdale,  
Lancs. OL16 1AH

**OLDHAM**  
PO Box 10, Oldham, Lancs. OL8 2WW

**BLACKBURN**  
PO Box 149, Blackburn,  
Lancs. BB2 2UQ

**BURNLEY**  
c/o PO Box 15, Todmorden,  
Lancs. OL14 7NQ

**NELSON & COLNE**  
c/o PO Box 15, Todmorden,  
Lancs. OL14 7NQ

**TODMORDEN**  
PO Box 15, Todmorden, Lancs. OL14 7NQ

**BLACKPOOL**  
PO Box 53, South Shore,  
Blackpool FY4 1FS

**LEEDS**  
PO Box BR10, Bramley, Leeds 13

**BRADFORD**  
PO Box 565, Bradford BD10 0YZ

**HUDDERSFIELD**  
PO Box A43, Huddersfield HD1 4NN

**DEWSBURY**  
PO Box 32, Dewsbury WF12 0YU

**HALIFAX**  
PO Box 133, Halifax HX3 6HB

**HULL**  
PO Box 558, Hull HU5 3YW

**DARLINGTON**  
PO Box 61, Darlington,  
Co. Durham DL3 9RD

**TYNE & WEAR**  
PO Box 25, Sunderland SR3 1YZ

**EDINBURGH**  
PO Box 719, Edinburgh EH4 2SR

**MIDLOTHIAN**  
PO Box 14, Dalkeith EH22 5DL

**WEST LoTHIAN**  
PO Box 50, Livingston EH54 8JJ

**TAYSIDE**  
PO Box 210, Dundee DD1 9EP

**GLASGOW**  
PO Box 85, Glasgow G3 8UL

**NORTHERN IRELAND**  
PO Box 214, Belfast BT4 1AE

**JERSEY**  
c/o PO Box 160, Exeter,  
Devon EX1 3YY

## Find out about the British National Party

Send 50p for information pack to:-

**P.O. BOX 117**

**WELLING**

**KENT DA16 3DW**

(Telephone enquiries to 081 316 4721)

Name.....

Address.....

I enclose.....